

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, June, 1891.

THE GROWTH OF SUBJECTIVISM IN GERMAN LITERATURE DURING THE LATER MIDDLE AGES.

THE period of German literature which forms the subject of this essay is not one which would at first sight attract the attention of the student of literary history. The religious fervor of the Crusades, the aristocratic noblesse of the Minnesingers, the dignity and grace of the court romancers, are now things of the past. The glory of the Empire is decaying; the Church is losing its hold, if not on the masses, at least on the best minds of the educated; the knight-hood, financially embarrassed and morally degraded, is gradually sinking to a state of organized highway robbery and plunder; and in the cities, which now take the place of the nobility as the chief upholders of national honor and greatness, it is the useful rather than the beautiful, the practical rather than the ideal, common sense rather than genius, which predominate. One generation, at the turning-point of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, had produced HARTMANN, WOLFRAM, GOTTFRIED, WALTHER V. D. VOGELWEIDE, the singers of the Nibelungenlied and of Gudrun; now there follow three centuries without a single great name in literature, without a single achievement of more than relative or historical interest.

And yet, these same centuries, far from being a waste in the development of German civilization, belong to the most fruitful epochs which the history of the German mind has ever seen. If they have given us no WOLFRAM, they have prepared the way for a DÜRER; if they have produced no Nibelungenlied, they have strewn the seed from which LUTHER sprang; if they fell behind the time of the Crusades in explosive enthusiasm, in chivalrous devotion and in poetic fancy, they have at least brought to life a principle without which there would have been no LESSING, no GOETHE, no HEINE, in short no modern life: the principle of individualism.

It would of course be a mistake to attach to

the word individualism, when applied to the fourteenth century, the same fulness of meaning which it has for us of the present day. No mediæval man ever thought of himself as a perfectly independent being founded only on himself, or without a most direct and definite relation to some larger organism, be it empire, church, city, or guild. No mediæval man ever seriously doubted that the institutions within which he lived were divinely established ordinances, far superior and quite inaccessible to his own individual reason and judgment. No mediæval man ever conceived of nature as being something else than an instrument in the hand of God, destined to perform God's wonders and to please the eye of man. It was reserved to the eighteenth century to draw the last consequences of individualism; to see in man, in each individual man, an original, complete and independent entity; to derive the origin of state, church and society from the spontaneous action of these independent individuals; and to find in nature, animate and inanimate, the same traces of a free, self-willed personality that had been found in man.

And yet we can speak of individualism in the closing centuries of the Middle Ages; for they initiated the movement which the eighteenth century brought to a climax. Now, for the first time since the decay of classic literature, people at large began to give way to emotional introspections; now for the first time they dared to throw off the disguises of rank and station, and lay bare the human heart which is hidden behind it all. Now for the first time criticism lifted its head and attacked, if not the existing order of things itself, at least its evils and abuses. And now for the first time an attempt was made to reproduce the reality of nature in its thousandfold varied manifestations, and to feel in the twitter of the bird and the blooming of the flower the same pulse of life which is vibrating in our own body and brain.

It cannot be denied that the first traces of this movement are to be seen in the very climax of the preceding literary epoch. The Nibelungenlied abounds in scenes of wonderful realistic power. HARTMANN, WOLFRAM,

GOTTFRIED, although they give a consummate expression to the ideals of chivalry, yet at the same time demonstrate, each in his own way, the superiority of human feeling over society conventions. WALTHER is quite as unrestrained in revealing his own individual emotions, as he is bold in his attacks against the church and the princes. And yet it is not until literature, under the influence of the freely developing city life, becomes a reflex of the material and intellectual awakening of the middle classes, that this spirit of subjectivism, of criticism, of sympathy with life in all its phases, of realistic delight in all the forms and appearances of the outer world, becomes a pervading trait of popular literature.

Let us, then, see how this new spirit asserted itself in the three chief branches of the poetic literature of the time—in the Volkslied, in didactic poetry, and in the religious drama.

The very origin of the Volkslied betrays its human and distinctively personal nature. No doubt there is a great deal of truth in the assertion which, since HERDER's 'Von deutscher Art und Kunst,' has found its way into all literary histories, that the Volkslied is property and product of a whole nation. A song, once started, is taken up by the multitude; it is sung by so many different persons, in so many different ways, on so many different occasions, that in course of time, through additions, omissions and transformations, it loses its original character. It is moulded, as it were, by the stream of public imagination, as the pebbles in the brook are moulded and remoulded by the current of the water which carries them along. And yet it is equally certain that each Volkslied, in its original form, is property and product of an individual poet, and is brought to life through individual and personal experiences. If this were not self-evident, the German Volkslied of the fourteenth and fifteenth century would give ample proof of it. Although largely anonymous, it is so emphatically personal, that to quote all the songs which begin with *Ich, Du, Wir* or *Ihr*, or which are addressed to some definite person, would include about one-half of all songs that have been preserved to us: "*Ich hört ein sichellin rauschen*"—"Ich weiss ein fein brauns megdelin"—"*Ich stund an einem*

morgen"—"*Ich ritt mit lust durch einen wald*"—"Ei du feiner reuter, edler herre mein"—"*Was wollen wir aber heben an?*"—"Wol uf, ir lieben gsellen!"—etc., etc.

And not infrequently the author, if he does not openly give his name, hints at least at his occupation and station in life. This song, we hear, for instance, was sung by a student, another by a fisherman, another by a pilgrim, still others by a rider good at Augsburg, by a poor beggar, by a landsknecht free, by three maidens at Vienna. Or we hear a frank expression of the author's satisfaction with himself and his production:

"Wer ist der uns das liedlein sang
Aus freiem mut, ja mut?
Das tat eines reichen bauren sohn,
War gar ein junges blut."

Or we have coupled with this a reference to personal experiences, not necessarily connected with the subject of the song, but which the singer is anxious to have his hearers know:

"Der uns diss neuwe liedlein sang
er hats gar wol gesungen,
er ist dreimal in Frankreich gewest
und allzeit wieder kommen."

And now the subject matter of these songs itself! There is hardly a side of human character, there is hardly a phase of human life, hardly an event in national history, which did not find expression in them. It is as though the circulation of the national body had been quickened and its sensibilities been heightened, as though people were looking with keener eyes, and listening with more receptive ears, as though they were gathering the thousandfold impressions of the inner and outer world: of stars and clouds, of trees and brooks, of love and longing, of broken faith and heroic deeds—and were then giving shape to these impressions in melody and song. An unpretentious and succinct form it is. There is nothing in the Volkslied of the majestic massiveness of the Pindaric ode, nor of the finely chiselled elegance of the troubadour chanson. It is direct, simple, almost laconic. But this laconism is fraught with a deep sense of the living forces in nature and man, and its simplicity and directness serve only to convey impressions all the more vivid and striking, since they surprise us in the same way as

the naïve wisdom of a child surprises us. Sometimes a single touch, such as the often recurring "*Dort oben auf jenem berge*" or "*Dort niden an dem Rheine*," opens a wide view of a whole landscape, with rivers flowing, with castles on mountain-tops, and birds sporting in the air. A single picture reveals sometimes the relationship and kinship of all living beings, as for instance the image of the linden tree which is mourning with the deserted maiden:

"Es steht eine lind in diesem tal,
Ach Gott, was tut sie da,
Sie will mir helfen trauern,
Dass ich kein bulen hab."

A single stanza sometimes gives us an epitome of a whole human life, with all its joys, sorrows and catastrophes. What can be more impressive than the abruptness and seeming fragmentariness of the story, told in two short stanzas, of the youth who loved the miller's daughter. She lives upon yonder hill where the mill-wheel is turning; and when he looks up to her from the valley, then his senses are bewildered, and it seems to him as though not water but his love were flowing and foaming over the paddles of the wheel:

"Dort hoch auf jenem berge
Da get ein müllerad,
Das malet nichts denn liebe
Die nacht biss an den tag."

This is the first scene; but without transition there follows another picture: the mill is destroyed, the lovers have been parted, and the poor fellow is wandering away into loneliness and misery:

"Die mühle ist zerbrochen,
Die liebe hat ein end,
So gsegen dich got, mein feines lieb!
Jez far ich ins ellend."

What could be more delicately and softly drawn than that scene in the wheat-field, where the poet overhears from amidst the sound of the sickle the voices of two reaping girls, the one bewailing the loss of her dearest one, the other speaking lightly of it and rejoicing in her own happiness of newly awakened love:

Ich hort ein sichellin rauschen,
Wol rauschen durch das korn,
Ich hort ein feine magt klagen:
Sie het ir lieb verlorn.

'La rauschen, lieb, la rauschen!
Ich acht nit wie es ge;
Ich hab mir ein bulen erworben
In feiel und grünen kle,'

'Hast du ein bulen erworben
In feiel und grünen kle,
So ste ich hie alleine,
Tut meinem herzen we.'

What could be more thrilling and almost painfully graphic than the tale of the little boy who has been poisoned by his stepmother? He is coming back from his aunt's house, where the poison has been given to him; and the whole crime is revealed to us in seven short stanzas, consisting of questions and answers directed to and given by the boy, and winding up with a terrible curse against the cruel mother:

Kind, wo bist du hin gewesen?
kind, sage dus mir!
'nach meiner mutter schwester,
wie we ist mir!'

Kind, was gaben sie dir zu essen?
kind, sage dus mir!
'eine brüle mit pfeffer,
wie we ist mir!'

Kind, was gaben sie dir zu trinken?
kind, sage dus mir!
'ein glas mit rotem weine,
wie we ist mir!'

Kind, was gaben sie den hunden?
kind sage dus mir!
'eine brüle mit pfeffer,
wie we ist mir!'

Kind, was machten denn die hunde?
kind, sage dus mir!
'sie sturben zur selben stunde,
wie we ist mir!'

Kind, was soll dein vater haben?
kind, sage dus mir!
'einen stul in dem himmel,
wie we ist mir!'

Kind, was soll deine mutter haben?
kind, sage dus mir!
'einen stul in der hülle,
wie we ist mir!'

What, again, could be more rugged and sturdy than the short outcry of the brave Dithmarse freemen against the presumption of the Duke of Holstein in building a fortified castle within their boundaries? Their leader calls upon them to tear down the walls of the hateful structure:

Tredet herto, gi stolten Ditmarschen!
unsen kummer wille wi wreken,
wat hendeken gebuwet haen
dat konnen wol hendken tobreken.

And now the people themselves give vent to their wrath:

De Ditmarschen repen averlut:
'dat lide wi nu und nummermere,
wi willen darumme wagen hals und gut
und willen dat gar ummekeren.
Wi willen darumme wagen goet und bloet
und willen der alle umme sterven
er dat der Holsten er avermoet
so scholde unse schone lant vorderen.'

If, then, in the Volkslied of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries we notice a very marked advance over the Minnesinger poetry, in sympathy with real life, in truthfulness of feeling, and in graphic representation, we observe a similar progress in the didactic and descriptive poetry of the time, as compared with the court epics of the preceding epoch. To say it in one word: here lie the roots of the modern novel. Not as though any sustained and successful attempt had been made at that time to portray human character as developed under the influence of everyday occurrences and ordinary experiences; for Reinke de Vos, although it certainly is a most amusing and masterfully drawn caricature of human life and society, still retains too much of the weirdness and originality of animal nature to be termed a portrayal of human character. But if we thus have no work which in its totality could be called a forerunner of the modern novel, we have on the other hand a superabundance of situations, of incidents, of characters scattered all through this didactic literature, which are drawn with the same observation of detail, the same faithfulness to the apparently insignificant and ordinary, the same relentless reproduction of even the ugly and the revolting, which mark the realistic tendencies of our own time. Let me quote a few examples. In the middle of the thirteenth century a Bavarian poet wrote the story of MEIER HELMBRECHT, a young peasant who, despising the honest modesty of his father's home, embraces court life, associates with a robber-knight, and ends on the gallows. The scene when, on one of his plundering expeditions, he revisits his home for the first time since he has left it against his

father's warning and wishes, is as minutely and vividly drawn as anything that BALZAC ever wrote.

"When Helmbrecht rode up to his father's house, all the inmates ran to the gate, and the servants called out, not: 'Be welcome Helmbrecht'—that they did not dare to do—but: 'Our young lord, be graciously welcome.' He answered in Saxon dialect: '*Susterkin-dekin, got lâte iuch immer saelic sin.*' His sister ran to him and embraced him, when he said to her: '*Gratia vester.*' Last of all came the old folks rather slowly, and embraced him affectionately, when he said to his father in French: '*Deu sal,*'—and to his mother in Bohemian: '*Dobra ytra.*' Father and mother looked at each other, and the mother said to her husband: 'My lord, our senses have been bewildered, it is not our child, it is a Bohemian.' The father cried out: 'It is a Frenchman, it is not my son, whom I recommended to God.' And his sister Godelint said: 'It is not your son; to me he spoke in Latin, it must be a monk.' And a servant said: 'What I heard of him made me think he came from Saxony or Brabant; he said '*Susterkindekin,*' he surely is a Saxon. Then the old farmer said with direct simplicity: 'Is it you, my son Helmbrecht? Honor your mother and me, say a word in German, and I myself will groom your horse, I, and not my servant.' '*Ei waz sâkent ir, geburekin,*' answered the son, '*min parit, minen klaren tif soll dehein geburik man nimmer gripen an.*' The old man was grieved and frightened, but again said: 'Are you Helmbrecht, my son? Then I will roast you a chicken this very night. But if you are a stranger, a Bohemian or a Wendish man, then I have no shelter for you. If you are a Saxon or a Brabanter you must look for a meal by yourself, from me you shall have nothing, even though the night lasted a whole year. If you are a lord I have no beer or wine for you, go and find it with the lords.' Meanwhile it had become late and the boy knew there was no shelter for him in the neighborhood, so at last he said: 'Yes, I am he, I am Helmbrecht; once I was your son and servant.' 'Then tell me the names of my four oxen!' '*Ouwer, Ræme, Erge, Sunne;* I have often cracked my whip over them, they are the best oxen in the world; will you now receive me?' And the father cried out: 'Door and gate, chamber and closet, all shall be open to you.'

Almost contemporary with this scene from Bavarian peasant life is the description of everyday life in a North German town, which is given in BERNHARD VON GEST's '*Palponista,*' a satire on the follies and sins of the ruling aristocracy, interspersed with little sketches and pictures of the affairs and doings

of the common people, which in lifelikeness and blunt directness remind us of the Dutch painters. I select the description of a drunken row. The author introduces us into the principal inn of the town, where, as he says, all sorts of people come together, rich and poor, foreign and citizen, master and servant. At first a quiet conversation is carried on about affairs of war and peace, about the quality of the wine, about the character of the prince, and so forth; gradually, as the tongues become heavier, the scene becomes livelier and the talk more heated. A run-down merchant tells in a bragging way of his former travels on land and sea. "At that time," he says, "my vessel was heavy with precious wares; nowadays the grocer, who has never ventured more than a hundred yards outside the city walls, thinks himself my equal; nowadays the cobbler, or the weaver, drinks his wine, walks about in scarlet and rides on horseback; and would refuse my daughter even if I gave him a lump of silver into the bargain." Such talk, of course, is irritating to the common people, and one of the crowd retorts upon the merchant: "You miserable braggart, what's the use of all this high-flown rodomontade? After all your boasted adventures on land and sea, what has become of you? A good-for-nothing wretch. And that is because you always have been cheating and always will cheat." This is too much for the merchant. He pours his wine into the face of his defamer and lets his bumper land on his skull. Now a general fight ensues: with fists, boots, candlesticks, chairs they belabor each other, and there is a good deal of blood and many bruises. Finally they get tired and calm down; they call for more wine and drink cordially in honor of the reconciliation.

About a hundred years later the Bernese friar ULRICH BONER wrote his 'Edelstein,' a collection of parables and fables, intended, as the title indicates to serve as a magic stone against the evils and errors of the world. And again we find the same delight in minute descriptions of everyday happenings and inconspicuous events, the same predilection for the humble and lowly. I choose from this collection a parable which is very far from being delicate, in order to show to what length

the fourteenth century would go, how dangerously near the coarse it would venture, if there was a chance of realistic effect.

"One day the fever met the flea. Both had had a terrible night, and told their woes to each other. The flea said: I'm nearly dead of hunger. Last night, I went to a convent hoping for a good supper. But how sadly was I mistaken. I jumped upon a high bed, beautifully upholstered and richly dressed out. It was that of the abbess, a very fine lady. When in the evening she went to bed, she noticed me at once and cried: 'Irmentraut, where are you? come! bring the candle! quick!' I skipped off before the girl came, and when the light was out again, I went back to the same place as before. Again she called, again I skipped. And so it went all night long, and now you see I am completely tired out. Would to God that I had better luck.' The fever said: 'Well, don't think that I fared much better. I went to a working woman last night. When she noticed that I was shaking her, she sat down, brewed herself a strong broth and ate it, after which she poured a pail of water down her throat. Then she went to work to wash a lot of linen that she had standing in a tub; and she kept it up nearly all night long. I never spent such an uncomfortable night. At early dawn she put the tub on her head and carried it off to a brook, to rinse the washing. Then I had enough of her and ran away.'—The two now agree to change places the next night. The fever visits the abbess, the flea goes to the washerwoman's, and both have a satisfactory time of it. For the abbess has herself warmly covered up and treated to all sorts of delicacies, in which the fever of course partakes; and the washerwoman is so tired with her day's work that she immediately drops off and sleeps all night, without even suspecting that anything is wrong."

Now what is the meaning of all this? What does this revelling in small and common and trifling realities signify? It means this, that the emancipation of the middle classes, one of the greatest movements, perhaps the greatest, of modern history, had begun to assert itself; that the time had come when the peasant, the merchant, the artisan felt strong enough to claim their share in public life alongside with the clergy and knighthood [as HUGO VON TRIMBERG expresses it: *pfaffen, ritter und gebûre, (sind) sippe von natûre unt sûln bruderlichen leben*]; it means that the tide of that great popular upheaval against class-rule which reached its high-water-mark in the

religious reformation, had set in. A historical parallel naturally suggests itself. When the second climax of that great upheaval, the French Revolution, was approaching, it was heralded in France, England and Germany by a literary revolt. Instead of the gallant shepherds and shepherdesses, instead of the polite cavaliers and high-minded kings, which in the seventeenth century were deemed the only worthy subjects for fiction and drama, people now wanted to see men and women of their own flesh and blood, and FIELDING, DIDEROT and LESSING appeared as the regenerators of literature. So in the fourteenth century also, the old heroic and ideal figures of Siegfried, of Parzival, of Tristan, representatives of a by-gone aristocratic past, had lost their force; what people wanted to see in literature was their own life, their own narrow, crowded streets, their own gabled houses and steepled cathedrals, their own sturdy and homely faces.

It is from this point of view that the development of the third kind of poetic production which I mentioned at the beginning of the paper, the religious drama, seems to me most significant. Even apart from the legends in dialogue form by which the nun ROSWITHA VON GANDERSHEIM in the tenth century tried to counteract the baneful influence on the taste and morals of her sister nuns of the frivolous Latin comedies—which, however, confined as they were within convent walls, have had no lasting effect on the German stage—the beginnings of the sacred drama in Germany lie far back of the literary epoch which we are now considering. They were connected with the chief festivals of the Church, and found their basis in church liturgy and in biblical tradition. At Christmas time, when the annunciation, the song of the angels, the adoration of the shepherds and of the Magi, formed the main subjects of ritual and sermon, it might easily suggest itself to represent the same events in some simple dramatic manner, through a crib near the altar, through boys kneeling before it, through others offering symbolic substitutes for gold, myrrh and frankincense. On Good-Friday the reading of the dramatic scenes in the Gospels of Christ's passion and death, might easily develop into

an impersonation, however primitive, of the principal characters in this sublime tragedy. On Easter-day the elevation of the crucifix on the altar, which seems to have been one of the oldest parts of the Easter service, might easily lead to a representation of some events connected with the Resurrection. And to these three foremost plays on Christmas, Easter and Good-Friday, other performances on other festivals might easily be added.

During the height of chivalrous culture, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, these plays seem to have shared the ideal and sublime character which marked all the literary productions of that aristocratic period. They were given within the churches, they were performed mostly by the clergy, they hardly ever surpassed the sphere of thought and fancy which had received the sanction of the worldly and spiritual authorities.

From a contemporary and ardent admirer of Emperor *FREDERIC BARBAROSSA* we have an Easterplay entitled "*The Rise and Fall of Antichrist*," which perhaps better than any other reveals this ideal and elevated tone of the early sacred drama. Allegoric personages, Paganism and the Jewish Synagogue, open the play. The former extols the polytheistic view, which accords due reverence to all heavenly powers, while the latter opposes the One God to all who put their trust in created helpless beings. Then as a third, the Church comes forward in regal crown and armor, on her right hand Mercy with the olive-branch, on her left Justice with balance and sword. Against those who are of another faith than hers she pronounces eternal damnation. She is followed on the right by the pope and clergy, on the left by the emperor and his hosts. The kings of the earth bring up the rear. The emperor now demands the submission of the kings. All accord it except the king of France, who however at last is forced into obedience. Then the emperor starts for the Holy Land to deliver it from the hands of the Pagans. He triumphs over the enemies of Christendom, and then lays down his crown and sceptre in the house of the Lord. But now the hypocrites conspire against the church. In their midst is the Antichrist wearing a coat of mail beneath his wings,

and leading on his right hand Hypocrisy, on his left Heresy. In the very Temple of Jerusalem his followers erect the throne, and the Church, conquered and humiliated, is driven to the Papal See. Antichrist sends ambassadors to demand the homage of the world for himself, and all kings kneel before him except the German emperor. But although the emperor conquers him in pitched battle, Antichrist manages at last, through false miracles, to gain over the support of the Germans; he conquers Babylon and is received by the Jews as their Messiah; his earthly kingdom extends farther than any other realm. But now the prophets Elijah and Enoch appear, and preach the glory of the Saviour. A new struggle between the light and the darkness begins, but immediately comes to an abrupt end. A sound is heard from above, Antichrist falls, his followers flee away in haste and consternation, while the Church sings a hallelujah and announces that the Lord is coming to sit in judgment over the world.

If we now turn from this essentially allegoric drama, and passing over nearly two hundred and fifty years, on an Easter Sunday in the middle of the fifteenth century, mingle with the populace of a free German town, assembled on the marketplace to witness the representation of the Redeemer's resurrection, we shall see a very different spectacle. The first person that appears on the stage is a quack doctor and vendor of medicines. He has just come from Paris, where he has bought a great supply of salves and tonics and domestic wares, the usefulness of which he is not slow to impress upon his audience. But his salesman has run away and he wants another. Now a second personage of an equally doubtful character, by the name of Rubin, presents himself. He is still a young fellow, but an expert in all sorts of tricks. He is a pick-pocket, a gambler, a counterfeiter, and he has always managed to defy the courts except in Bavaria, where they caught him once, and branded his cheeks. To the doctor he seems the right man, and is engaged by him, the salary being fixed at a pound of mushrooms and a soft cheese. And since the streets are now beginning to be filled with a concourse of people, the two proceed at once to set up

their booth. At this moment there arises from amidst the crowd a wailing song. The three Maries lament the death of Christ:

‘Wir haben verloren Jesum Christ,
Der aller werlde ein tröster ist,
Marien son den reinen:
Darum musse wir beweinen
Swerlichen seinen tot:
Wenn er half uns aus grosser not—’

which is followed by the exhortation to go to his grave and anoint his body with ointment. The quack sees his chance at a good bargain; he sends Rubin to coax the women to his booth, and now there ensues a regular country fair scene. The three Maries evidently do not know the value of money; they offer to pay all they have, three Byzantine florins, and the merchant is so overcome by this unexpected readiness of his customers that he in turn gives them better stuff than he is accustomed to do. But here his wife, who, it seems, has a better business head, intercedes. She has made the salves herself, she knows they ought to sell for much more, and bids the women not touch one of them, and when her husband insists on his own agreement she abuses him as a drunkard and spendthrift, an attack which he answers by beating and kicking her. Finally they pack all their things together and move off, and again the farcical suddenly gives way to the pathetic. The three women arrive at the grave; but the stone has been rolled from it, and the angel accosts them singing:

“Er ist nicht hie den ir sucht:
Sunder get, ob irs gerucht
[Denn] er ist erstanden
Und gein Galilea gegangen.”

The scene closes with a chant of the three Maries, partly an expression of grief and sorrow that even the body of the Saviour should have been taken away from them:

“Owe der mere!
Owe der jemmerlichen klage!
Das grap ist lere:
Owe meiner tage!”—

partly an assertion of hope and confidence in the support of their Redeemer:

“Jesu, du bist der milde trost
Der uns von sunden hat erlost,
Von sunden und von sorgen
Den abent und den morgen.
Er hat dem teifel angesiget,
Der noch vil feste gebunden liget;
Er hat vil manche sele erlost,
O Jesu, du bist der werlde trost.”

If this play indicates to us how even the traditions of sacred history in the fifteenth century had been drawn into the circle of ordinary secular life, there are others which show that the realistic sense of the middle classes did not stop here. Sacred history to them had become not only secular, it had become local. Every crucifix in the German land was a Golgotha, every cathedral in a German town was a Jerusalem, every baptismal font was a Jordan, in which at any time the figure of the Saviour might be seen, bowing down before the erect form of John, while from above would be heard the word: "*This is my son, in whom I am well pleased.*" The most remarkable example of this blending of the secular with the religious, the local with the universal, the ephemeral with the eternal, which gives to most productions of this period such a weird fascination and power, is a play which seems to have been produced at Wismar on the Baltic in the year 1464. This play, also, begins with the resurrection of Christ, but the resurrection takes place not in Jerusalem, but in the good old town of Wismar itself. Pilate, who appears as the type of a crafty, strongheaded, stately burgomaster, hears a rumor that Christ's followers intend to steal his body, therefore he details four soldiers to watch the grave, one to the north, one to the south, one to the east, and one to the west. They behave very much like the traditional stage policemen, clatter with their swords, threaten to smash anyone who would dare to come near them, and then go quietly to sleep, having first made an arrangement with the night-watchman, who is stationed on the steeple of the cathedral, to look out for them. The watchman sees a vessel approaching on the Baltic (to heighten the realistic effect the names of two islands at the entrance of the harbor of Wismar are mentioned). He tries to awaken the soldiers, but in vain. Then he hears the dogs barking, and calls out the midnight hour. And now, amid the singing of angels and a sudden earthquake, Jesus arises and sings:

"Nu synt alle dynke vullenbracht
de dar vor in der ewicheit weren bedacht,
dat ik des bitteren dodes scholde sterven,
unt deme mynschen gnade wedder vorwerven."

It would be easy to multiply these examples.

It might be mentioned how, towards the end of this play, Lucifer summons the various trades of the town before him and makes them confess their most secret sins; the baker his using too much yeast in the bread, the shoemaker his selling sheepskin for Cordovan leather, the innkeeper his adulteration of the wine, and so forth. One might point out that the scene where Judas accepts the thirty pieces of silver is used as an opportunity to crack jokes about the debasement of the currency. One might refer to the fact that the biblical report that John outran Peter to the sepulchre, is turned, in some of these plays, into a regular running match between the two apostles. But enough has been said to illustrate the fact that the realism which from the VAN EYCKS down to ALBRECHT DÜRER was the distinguishing feature of German art, was also a most pronounced characteristic of the German drama of this period. This realism, together with the bold individuality of the lyrical, the satirical aggressiveness of the descriptive poetry, has stamped this entire age as one great battle against traditional views of life, as the first war in Christian history for the independence and elevation of the masses, for the delivery of the individual conscience and intellect.

KUNO FRANCKE.

Harvard University.

A STUDY OF THE VERSIFICATION AND RIMES IN HUGO'S "HER- NANI."

ON page 146 et seq. of his '*Traité général de Versification française*,' M. BECQ DE FOUQUIÈRES gives us some data concerning the comparative frequency of the different types of the classic Alexandrine line in RACINE, and the degree of importance which its romantic variation assumes in HUGO's '*Légendes des siècles*.' With regard to the last-named point, however, the figures given there are extremely unsatisfactory, because of their incompleteness. Only seven types of the classic verse (making 72%), and two types of the romantic line (making 7%), are mentioned; the remaining 21% of lines are left to be supplied by the reader's imagination. Notwithstanding the importance of a definite knowledge as to the

relative proportion of classic and romantic lines which the master-workman of the Alexandrine verse unconsciously employed, the page above referred to is to my knowledge the only place where a systematized answer to the question has been attempted. The classification of all of HUGO's Alexandrines would perhaps be a useless task. Quite as satisfactory an answer, it would seem to me, might be obtained by subjecting a certain limited portion of the poet's work at different stages in his long career to a microscopic test. Whatever accusations may have been brought, and often justly, against our author, it has been conceded by all that he was the absolute master of his language. His rhythmical intuition guided his hand to mingle classic and romantic elements in such just proportions, that even so great an admirer of the harmony of classic verse as M. BECQ DE FOUQUIÈRES is forced to say: "*La révolution romantique se trouve donc légitimée par la puissance de l'effet obtenu.*" But was that musical ideal, of which, perhaps, the poet was himself not conscious, the same throughout the whole of his busy life? Or do his later productions show a keener ear and surer workmanship? M. BECQ DE FOUQUIÈRES limits his observations to the tragedies of RACINE, which he calls "*l'art classique dans sa forme la plus parfaite,*" and to the "*Légendes des siècles,*" "*l'art romantique dans sa forme la plus libre.*"

It is with this question in mind that I venture to publish the following classification of the romantic lines in HERNANI. Some thirty years lie between it and the models of M. BECQ DE FOUQUIÈRES. We shall scarcely feel inclined to criticise him, when on page 102 of his work we find the statement that three-fourths of HUGO's lines are still classic, and on page 129, that four-fifths of them still follow the old models. Yet nothing but absolute certainty can satisfy the student with reference to any question of scientific interest.

In the following account* the metres are arranged in the order of most frequent occurrence. Some of the verses are not entirely

*The verses are numbered consecutively throughout the play, as they will be found in an edition of "Hernani" to be published shortly by Messrs. D. C. Heath & Co. The headings (3—5—4, etc.) denote the number of syllables in each of the three rhythmic elements of the romantic line.

free from doubt, inasmuch as they admit of different modes of scansion. In all such cases I have been led by the sense and syntax of the line.

3—5—4 (105 times):

29, 35, 63, 94, 129, 162, 166, 174, 181, 183, 191, 216, 234, 243, 250, 260, 264, 282, 283, 339, 351, 366, 412, 415, 442, 469, 474, 478, 481, 485, 500, 509, 512, 528, 549, 559, 569, 574, 591, 665, 679, 704, 722, 751, 793, 817, 820, 839, 848, 896, 934, 978, 1012, 1029, 1035, 1047, 1051, 1052, 1064, 1087, 1106, 1110, 1124, 1182, 1237, 1247, 1252, 1255, 1284, 1356, 1425, 1453, 1455, 1470, 1477, 1482, 1491, 1504, 1525, 1571, 1572, 1586, 1588, 1593, 1601, 1667, 1694, 1703, 1717, 1736; 1770, 1778, 1813, 1818, 1827, 1849, 1894, 1899, 1902, 1909, 2040, 2080, 2092, 2146, 2150.

3—6—3 (78 times):

42, 70, 112, 128, 133, 140, 152, 153, 187, 200, 218, 239, 367, 370, 420, 462, 466, 467, 518, 524, 550, 556, 566, 568, 573, 586, 601, 605, 608, 611, 651, 719, 752, 804, 806, 812, 874, 925, 946, 964, 1001, 1037, 1095, 1101, 1181, 1203, 1218, 1298, 1302, 1328, 1344, 1349, 1401, 1413, 1506, 1507, 1508, 1566, 1594, 1617, 1629, 1658, 1661, 1720, 1734, 1749, 1869, 1870, 1888, 1903, 1973, 1984, 2042, 2053, 2058, 2065, 2118, 2139.

4—5—3 (70 times):

48, 60, 92, 103, 127, 142, 155, 160, 164, 173, 222, 315, 335, 357, 359, 381, 409, 499, 519, 526, 604, 617, 620, 640, 652, 721, 822, 891, 945, 956, 991, 992, 1074, 1094, 1161, 1163, 1234, 1277, 1283, 1331, 1388, 1391, 1409, 1444, 1486, 1493, 1499, 1561, 1677, 1693, 1721, 1741, 1774, 1782, 1797, 1822, 1836, 1858, 1881, 1923, 1980, 1995, 2018, 2029, 2052, 2112, 2131, 2133, 2138, 2159.

4—4—4 (69 times):

39, 49, 99, 121, 125, 147, 149, 159, 172, 182, 196, 208, 227, 297, 346, 395, 419, 423, 450, 454, 463, 493, 529, 595, 624, 642, 664, 675, 681, 688, 701, 720, 761, 810, 843, 877, 961, 1026, 1075, 1104, 1120, 1126, 1134, 1146, 1175, 1186, 1211, 1267, 1351, 1364, 1419, 1424, 1439, 1443, 1458, 1478, 1483, 1639, 1657, 1716, 1769, 1809, 1848, 1885, 1920, 1927, 1961, 1975, 2134.

2—6—4 (56 times):

38, 41, 86, 146, 203, 267, 307, 344, 371, 377, 384, 468, 521, 571, 646, 746, 750, 759, 803, 805, 853,

858, 890, 940, 942, 984, 1015, 1024, 1028, 1127, 1129, 1193, 1212, 1215, 1232, 1250, 1322, 1358, 1377, 1461, 1592, 1630, 1648, 1649, 1662, 1665, 1714, 1743, 1753, 1789, 1829, 1838, 1982, 2036, 2077, 2086.

4—6—2 (26 times):

8, 101, 313, 532, 548, 584, 586, 706, 762, 768, 791, 834, 873, 926, 1030, 1050, 1105, 1313, 1553, 1554, 1817, 1873, 1886, 1887, 2038, 2144.

2—5—5 (8 times):

4, 290, 293, 464, 763, 1495, 1559, 1882.

3—4—5 (7 times):

506, 911, 1578, 1581, 1746, 1954, 2010.

5—3—4 (7 times):

34, 826, 849, 857, 1366, 1370, 1474.

5—4—3 (6 times):

25, 737, 859, 1521, 1895, 2045.

1—6—5 (6 times):

290, 340, 798, 989, 1311, 1970.

4—3—5 (4 times):

317, 841, 913, 1337.

5—5—2 (4 times):

365, 647, 660, 1725.

No examples are found of the two types 5—2—5, and 5—6—1. There occur, however, the following variations of the romantic line, for which M. BECQ DE FOUQUIÈRES makes no provision.

2—7—3 (44 times):

143, 185, 209, 296, 332, 385, 455, 456, 475, 497, 508, 534, 668, 680, 699, 747, 773, 814, 825, 887, 889, 921, 952, 990, 1005, 1119, 1123, 1135, 1145, 1314, 1341, 1432, 1522, 1627, 1688, 1701, 1705, 1740, 1883, 1919, 1921, 1950, 1957, 2020.

3—7—2 (28 times):

324, 443, 522, 552, 567, 654, 655, 727, 790, 835, 879, 919, 957, 967, 1029, 1038, 1045, 1084, 1140, 1141, 1155, 1195, 1281, 1306, 1310, 1315, 1765, 2069.

1—7—4 (21 times):

16, 167, 319, 350, 444, 731, 1020, 1032, 1086, 1185, 1245, 1286, 1299, 1541, 1647, 1867, 1876, 1987, 2115, 2137, 2147.

1—8—3 (7 times):

671, 1093, 1369, 1387, 1591, 1631, 2149.

2—8—2 (6 times):

258, 555, 1096, 1254, 1333, 1620.

3—8—1 (once):—22.

Thus it appears that there are, in all, 553 romantic Alexandrines, or lines consisting of three rhythmic elements, in "Hernani." The result differs in some respects from that obtained by M. BECQ DE FOUQUIÈRES. The two romantic types which he found of most frequent occurrence were 4—4—4 (5%) and 3—5—4 (2%). In "Hernani" the type 3—5—4 occurs oftenest (4.8%), followed by 3—6—3 (3.6%), and 4—5—3 and 4—4—4 (each 3.2%). The total number of romantic lines is about one-fourth, or 25.3%, which agrees with the results of M. BECQ DE FOUQUIÈRES. Of the remaining 1613 classic verses a number can however not be called truly classic Alexandrines, although they consist of four rhythmic elements. In many, the principal cæsura does not coincide with the hemistich, but falls after the first or third rhythmic element. Often the cause of this irregularity is the overflow, or some other complication of syntax. This takes place in lines 27, 28, 186, 288, 418, 434, 472, 477, 509, 689, 847, 897, 899, 910, 939, 965, 986, 1003, 1045, 1068, 1097, 1169, 1318, 1353, 1357, 1363, 1365, 1484, 1514, 1555, 1584, 1605, 1675, 1689, 1698, 1719, 1722, 1740, 1776, 1780, 1784, 1819, 1833, 1839, 1846, 1863, 1872, 1907, 1917, 1924, 1939, 1951, 2037, 2059, 2121, 2157. In other cases the irregularity is caused by the dialogue, which in classic verse divided the lines usually at the hemistich; here this division may fall anywhere within the line; compare lines 75, 207, 215, 609, 610, 618, 1011, 1147, 1166, 1176, 1204, 1208, 1229, 1233, 1254, 1265, 1350, 1371, 1378, 1431, 1636, 1676, 1702, 1766, 1787, 1815, 1841, 1859, 1972, 1983, 2009, 2022, 2047, 2051, 2090, 2125.

The rimes are distributed as follows:

sufficient rimes	482,
rich rimes	532,
over-rich rimes	69.

Denoting the vowel by *v*, the consonant(s) by *c* and the unaccented syllable of the feminine rime by *e*, we find the following proportions: *v*: *v* 48, *ve*: *ve* 8, *vc*: *vc* 127, *vce*: *vce* 299; *cv*: *cv* 89, *cve*: *cve* 45, *cvc*: *cvc* 234, *cvce*: *cvce* 164; *vcv*: *vcv* 12, *vcve*: *vcve* 7, *vcvc*: *vcvc* 23, *vcvce*: *vcvce* 16.

Besides these, there are eleven very rich rimes which are not contained in this classification, viz.: *cvcv* 711, 1419, 1723, 1853; *cvce*

1109, *cvcvc* 1291, 2013; and *cvcvce* 1497, 1577, 1581, 1789.

While the rich rimes are of most frequent occurrence (sufficient rimes 44.5%, rich rimes 49.1%, over-rich rimes 6.3%), it cannot be said that the play shows that love for rich and over-rich rimes which became one of the characteristics of the Romantic school. It is seen that *vce*, a merely sufficient feminine rime, is the type recurring oftenest, followed by the masculine rime *cvc*. HUGO is however a great artist in selecting his rime-words, and even his feeblest rimes usually contain strong and full vowels. Of the 48 sufficient rimes 35 are in *oi*, 5 in *ui*, 3 in *eu*, 2 in *ieu* and only 1 each in *ou*, *ie* and *é*.

JOHN E. MATZKE.

Indiana University.

THE PRONUNCIATION OF THE GERMAN STAGE.

I accede with pleasure to the suggestion of Professor BRANDT, and subjoin the rules for pronunciation which were in force in the royal theatres while I was in Berlin. They were issued by Count VON HOCHBERG, Chef des preussischen königlichen Schauspiels und General-Intendant der königlichen Schauspiele in Berlin. I have no means of knowing how generally these rules were promulgated or enforced in the other royal theatres of Hanover, Cassel und Wiesbaden, which, like that at Berlin, are directly under the Ministerium des königlichen Hauses. The present directions were only intended to be provisional and are confined to one letter of the alphabet. At the same time the Count VON HOCHBERG assured me that he purposed extending them.

I intended to make these rules the basis of a paper on the stage pronunciation of German, but like so many plans it has been displaced by other engrossing work. The question of pronunciation in the theatres is one of fact, and can be established by careful observation or inquiry. Professor BRANDT's statement that there is a standard German pronunciation among the cultivated, based upon that of the stage, which is the same as exhibited in his grammar, seemed to me made with too great positiveness. As a result of observation

which I had sought to make carefully and accurately in Berlin, Munich, Zürich, Leipsic, Dresden, Frankfort and Weimar, I had formed the opinion which I expressed, that there is no uniform stage pronunciation of German and that in one theatre there is a variety of pronunciation among the different actors of the same company. I regret that my experience did not include the famous Burg Theatre in Vienna, which is usually held to be unapproached in Germany in the perfection of its art. A letter of inquiry which I addressed to Munich asking whether any standard of pronunciation had been prescribed for that stage was answered: "Every member of our court theatre must in a certain degree be the master of his own delivery (*Vortragsmeister*), that is, before his entrance into the union of our art-institution, he must have learned a clear and correct pronunciation of German. Finally, it is the task of our *Régisseur* to exert his influence to maintain a uniform and artistic mode of speech and to correct at once any false accents." This of course leaves untouched what constitutes correct speech.

BEHAGEL ('Die deutsche Sprache' p. 57) after speaking of the variety of pronunciation of *g* in different localities, now as *j*, now as *ch*, and now as a stop, says "no one of them is recognized as alone correct. The same holds of *ng* at the end of a word, which, in many localities, is pronounced as *nk*, e. g., *der Gank*, *der Sprunk* (for *Gang* and *Sprung*)."—He goes on to say that in one field the necessity for a uniform pronunciation has already led to unity but by no means to an absolute one, that is, in the case of the German theatre. This authoritative factor has decided that *g* is to be pronounced as in the French *garder*, *gonfalon*, *guipure*. BEHAGEL does not state whether *g* is to have this pronunciation under all circumstances, but seems to imply it. This of course is not the pronunciation of *g* as *k* which Professor BRANDT lays down, and illustrates anew the fact that the usage of the stage may be differently interpreted. In the case of the Meininger, BEHAGEL says the pronunciation of one and the same actor is not uniform.

BENEDIX, who busied himself with the stage either as director or play-wright throughout his entire life, gives in "Der mündliche Vor-

trag" the pronunciation of many words, but warns against pronouncing *g* as *k*. We may summarize the results which we have thus far obtained in accepting the pronunciation of the stage as our standard: Professor BRANDT says that final *g* is pronounced like *k*; BEHAGEL ('Die deutsche Sprache,' p. 57) says it is pronounced like *g* in the French *garder*; the rules issued for the Royal Theatres say *g* is never to be pronounced like *k*; BENEDIX says it is pronounced like a rough aspirate, "harthauchend." Whenever the theatres adopt a uniform pronunciation they will powerfully affect popular usage. If the schools should attempt to teach one standard, the result would soon be manifest. A young Referendar in Berlin told me that in his school days he could not recall a single instance when an attempt had been made to correct his pronunciation. In his final examinations before leaving for the University, one of the examiners suggested that he should not speak quite so "Frankfurterisch." It will aid our inquiry if Professor BRANDT will state the theatres where the pronunciation which he recommends is adopted.

The pronunciation of *g* final as *k* has a historical basis: it is consistent, logical and defensible by analogy. But when its adoption is commended on account of its general use upon the stage and because it is the standard of correct speech among the educated, in short the *alleinseigmachende* pronunciation, my experience leads me to dissent from the claims upon which so general an assertion is based. Whether a provincial pronunciation will at last become fashionable, and lead to ultimate unity in speech in a nation so tenacious in its adherence to past usage and so insensible to phonetic distinctions, may be questioned.

W. T. HEWETT.

Cornell University.

COUNT VON HOCHBERG'S RULES.

Zur Erzielung einer einheitlich richtigen Aussprache des Consonanten *G* auf den königlichen Bühnen, sind folgende Vorschriften, bei deren Entwurf auf die diesbezüglichen Ansichten TIECK'S und EDUARD DEVRIENT'S Rücksicht genommen worden ist, von nun an für die Mitglieder der königlichen Theater massgebend:

Die allgemeine Aussprache des Buchstabens *g* ist der *leicht anschlagende*, zwischen dem *ch* und *k* liegende Gaumenlaut. Ausnahmsweise wird *g* wie ein *weiches ch* gesprochen, jedoch nie wie *k*.

Anschlagend (seinem vollen Werthe nach) ist das *g* also zu sprechen:

1. Am Anfang der Wörter und Silben, z. B. in Gott, geben, gut, Glanz, Köni-ge weni-ge, flüchti-ge, ge-gessen, Aus-gabe, ver-geben.

2. Als Auslauter hinter einem Vokal (ob kurz oder lang), z. B. in Tag, lag, Schlag, Weg, hinweg, Steg, log, flog, betrog, trug, klug, schlug, genug, unsäglich, beweglich, erträglich, möglich.

3. Hinter einem Consonanten, z. B. in Balg, Talg, Sarg, karg, Berg, Zwerg, verbirg, Burg.

4. Zwischen zwei Consonanten, z. B. in kargt, balgt, verbergt, birgt, borgt, folgt, schwelgt.

5. Vor *d* und *t*, z. B. in Jagd, Magd, sagt, klagt, hegt, schlägt, beugt, liegt.

6. In der langen Silbe *ieg*, z. B. in Sieg, Krieg, stieg, schwiegen.

Als Ausnahme von der Regel wird das *g* wie ein *weiches ch* gesprochen und zwar:

1. In der kurzen Silbe *ig* wenn dieselbe im Auslaut eines Wortes steht, z. B. in König=Könich, wenig=wenich, Honig=Honich.

2. In zusammengesetzten Wörtern, z. B., Königreich=Könichreich, Honigkuchen=Honichkuchen, Wenigkeit=Wenichkeit.

3. Wenn das *i* vor dem *g* durch einen Apostroph ersetzt wird, z. B. ew'ge=ew'che, heil'ge=heil'che, geist'ge=geist'che.

4. Wenn auf die Silbe *-ig* ein *s*, *st*, oder *t* folgen, z. B. Königs=Könichs, wenigste=wenichste, beleidigt=beleidicht, gereinigt=gereinicht, Das *g* nach *n*, wenn es mit diesem gleichsam einen Laut bildet, darf nur kaum anschlagend und nie *k* gesprochen werden; z. B. spreche man: Rang, nicht Rank; Klang, nicht Klank; langsam, nicht lanksam; langweilig, nicht lankweilig; Ring, nicht Rink; Hoffnung, nicht Hoffnunk; Bildung, nicht Bildunk; Huldigung nicht Huldigunk. Schliesslich darf das *g* nicht vom *n* getrennt werden. Man spreche also: Engel und nicht En-gel, Angel und nicht An-gel; Mangel und nicht Man-gel.

GRAF VON HOCHBERG.

Berlin, Januar, 1887.

RUSKIN AND ALFRED'S PRAYER.

In 1885, three lectures delivered by RUSKIN in Oxford were published under the title, 'The Pleasures of England.' In the second of these, entitled "The Pleasures of Faith," occurs the following passage:

"Remember in their successive order,—of monks, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, St. Martin, St. Benedict, and St. Gregory; of kings,—and your national vanity may be surely enough appeased in recognizing two of them for Saxon,—Theodoric, Charlemagne, Alfred, Canute, and the Confessor. I will read three passages to you, out of the literal words of three of these ten men, without saying whose they are, that you may compare them with the best and most exalted you have read expressing the philosophy, the religion, and the policy of to-day."

This he accordingly proceeds to do, quoting first an extract from AUGUSTINE'S 'City of God.' Then he adds: "This for the philosophy. Next, I take for example of the Religion of our ancestors, a prayer, personally and passionately offered to the Deity conceived as you have this moment heard."

'O Thou who art the Father of that Son which has awakened us, and yet urgeth us out of the sleep of our sins, and exhorteth us that we become Thine;' (note you that, for apprehension of what Redemption means, against your base and cowardly modern notion of 'scaping whipping. Not to take away the Punishment of Sin, but by His Resurrection to raise us out of the sleep of sin itself! Compare the legend at the feet of the Lion of the Tribe of Judah in the golden Gospel of Charles le Chauve:—

"HIC LEO SURGENDO PORTAS CONFREGIT AVERNI
QUI NUNQUAM DORMIT, NUSQUAM DORMITAT IN ÆVUM;")

'To Thee, Lord, I pray, who art the supreme truth; for all the truth that is, is truth from Thee. Thee I implore, O Lord, who art the highest wisdom. Through Thee are wise all those that are so. Thou art the true life, and through Thee are living all those that are so. Thou art the supreme felicity, and from Thee all have become happy that are so. Thou art the highest good, and from Thee all beauty springs. Thou art the intellectual light, and from Thee man derives his understanding.

To Thee, O God, I call and speak. Hear, O hear me, Lord! for Thou art my God and my Lord; my Father and my Creator; my ruler and my hope; my wealth and my honor; my house, my country, my salvation, and my life! Hear, hear me, O Lord! Few of Thy servants comprehend Thee. But Thee alone I love,† indeed, above all other things. Thee

† Meaning—not that he is of those few, but that, without comprehending, at least, as a dog, he can love.

I seek: Thee I will follow: Thee I am ready to serve. Under Thy power I desire to abide, for Thou alone art the Sovereign of all. I pray Thee to command me as Thou wilt."

Two pages further on he says: "The Philosophy is Augustine's; the Prayer Alfred's."

Though RUSKIN asserts that the prayer is ALFRED'S, I have found a curious parallel to it in the pages of a Latin writer, in fact no less a person than the AUGUSTINE from whom the Philosophy is extracted. That my readers may see how close the parallel is, I subjoin a part of AUGUSTINE'S prayer, omitting far the the larger part, and citing only so much as is relevant to this inquiry.

"Pater evigilationis atque illuminationis nostræ, pater pignoris quo admonemur redire ad te. Te invoco, Deus veritas, in quo et a quo et per quem vera sunt, quæ vera sunt omnia. Deus sapientia, in quo et a quo et per quem sapiunt, quæ sapiunt omnia. Deus vera et summa vita, in quo et a quo et per quem vivunt, quæ vere summeque vivunt omnia. Deus beatitudo, in quo et a quo et per quem beata sunt, quæ beata sunt omnia. Deus bonum et pulchrum, in quo et a quo et per quem bona et pulchra sunt, quæ bona et pulchra sunt omnia. Deus intelligibilis lux, in quo et a quo et per quem intelligibiliter lucent, quæ intelligibiliter lucent omnia. . . . Exaudi, exaudi, exaudi me, Deus meus, Domine meus, rex meus, pater meus, causa mea, spes mea, res mea, honor meus, domus mea, patria mea, salus mea, lux mea, vita mea. Exaudi, exaudi, exaudi me more illo tuo paucis notissimo. Jam te solum amo, te solum sequor, te solum quæro, tibi soli servire paratus sum, quia tu solus juste dominaris; tui juris esse cupio."

This passage is to be found in AUGUSTINE'S 'Soliloquies,' Bk. i, ch. 1. (MIGNE, 'Patr. Lat.' xxxii, 869-872). But how then could it occur to RUSKIN to attribute it to ALFRED? Evidently because he found it among the writings ascribed by scholars to ALFRED. In truth, it is part of the so-called Anthology published by COCKAYNE in the 'Shrine,' pp. 163-204, our extract being found on pp. 166-9. Of this the translator is asserted to be ALFRED by Prof. WÜLKER, in his article on the subject in PAUL und BRAUNE'S *Beiträge* iv, 101-131, and his conclusion has not been seriously impugned.

ALFRED, then, merely translated this prayer from AUGUSTINE, yet RUSKIN speaks of it as "personally and passionately offered to

the Deity" by ALFRED, and thousands of people who read his book are likely to take him at his word. Yet it would scarcely seem that RUSKIN obtained his translation at second-hand. It is not identical with a rendering of part of the prayer by THOMAS HUGHES, in his 'Alfred the Great,' ch. 16, nor is it the same as the version in the Jubilee Edition of ALFRED'S works. Besides, in both these places the original authorship of the prayer is clearly recognized, though HUGHES refers it to his "adaptation from St. AUGUSTINE'S 'Blossom Gatherings,'" instead of from the 'Soliloquies,' thus showing a confusion of thought with respect to the two titles. But if RUSKIN did make the translation himself, he has not always seized upon the meaning of the original. It so happens that two of his inexact renderings are at points to which he has called special attention by comments. The first is after the words "exhorteth us that we become Thine," which is not what AUGUSTINE says, and just as little what ALFRED says: "ús mannað þæt wé tó þé becumen." The second is: "But Thee alone I love." Here RUSKIN takes pains to explain that the *but* does not carry one of its two natural meanings. This explanation, however, might have been spared, had he observed that the *but* is by no means the necessary translation of either the Latin or the Old English. The Latin has *jam*; the Old English runs: "þé áne ic lufige sóðlice ofer æalle oðre þing."

Is it not a pity to spoil such effective rhetoric, and mar so telling an illustration? Perhaps; but there is a 'pity of it' on the other side, too, and it is one which will not have escaped the attentive reader of this note.

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

ALFRED'S "PRAYER-MEN, WAR-MEN, AND WORK-MEN."

IN ALFRED'S translation of 'Boethius,' chap. 17, occurs this sentence regarding a king: "He sceal habban gebedmæn, and fyrdmæn, and weorcmen." I think I have discovered that ALFRED must have had a Latin original for the three nouns, other than the seventh prose of the second book, which he

was nominally translating. The sentence occurs in the midst of a passage which has been regarded as among the most original in ALFRED'S works, and perhaps there is no reason to doubt that, on the whole, it is so. But the "gebedmen, and fyrdmen, and weorcmen" must, I am convinced, translate the plurals of *orator*, *bellator*, and *laborator*, or their equivalents. The reason for this conclusion may briefly be shown. It is found in a comparison with two passages, one from ÆLFRIC 'On the New Testament,' or rather from a paragraph appended to that piece (L'ISLE, 'A Saxon Treatise,' pp. 40-41):

"Witan sceoldon sméagan mid wislicum geþeahhte, þonne on mancinne tó micel yfel bið, hwilc ðæra stelenna þæs cinestóles wære tóbrocen, and bétan ðone sóna. Se cinestól stynt on þisum þrim stelum: laboratōres, bellatores, oratores. Laboratores sind yrðlingas and æhtmen, tó þám anum betēhte, þe hig ús bigleofan tiliað. Oratores syndon þe ús ðingiað tó Gode, and cristendóm fyrðriað on cristenum folcum on Godes þeowdóm tó ðám gástlican gewinne, tó þám anum betēhte ús eallum tó pearfe. Bellatores sindon þe úre burga healdað and eac úrum eard wið þone sigendne here, feohtende mid wæmnum, swá swá Paulus sæde, se þeoda lárēow, on his lárēowdóme: Non sine causa portat miles gladium, et cetera; 'Ne byrð ná se cniht bútan intingan his swurd.' Hē ys Godes þen þe sylfum tó pearfe on ðám yfelum wyrrendum tó wræce gesett. On þisum þrim stelum stynt se cynestól, and gif an bið forud, he fylð áðun sóna, þám oðrum stelum tó unðearfe gewiss."

The other passage is from WULFSTAN'S Fiftieth Homily in NAPIER'S edition (p. 267):

"Ælc riht cynestól stent on þrým stapelum, þe fullice áriht stent: an is oratores, and oðer is laboratores, and þrydde is bellatores. Oratores syndon gebedmen, þe Gode sceolon þeowian dæges and nihtes for þæne cyngc, and for ealne þeodscipe þingian georne. Laboratores syndon weorcmen, þe tilian sceolon þæs, þe eall þeodscipe big sceal lybban. Bellatores syndon wigmæn, þe eard sculon werman wiglice mid wæpnon. On þysum þrým stapelum sceal ælc eynestol standan mid rihte; and, áwácyge heora ænig, sóna se stól scylfð; and, fulberste heora ænig, þonne hrýst se stól nyðer, and þæt wyrð þære þeode eall tó unpearfe. Ac stalige man and strangie and trymme hī georne mid wislicre Godes lage and mid rihtlicre woroldlage; þæt wyrð þám þeodscipe tó langsuman réde. And sóð is þæt wé secgað, áwácyge se cristendóm, sóna scylfð se cynedóm."

Whence the riming triad is derived is not clear. From a writer of the end of the eleventh to the beginning of the twelfth century DU CANGE'S 'Glossarium' quotes as follows, s. v. *Orator*: "Baldricus lib. 3. Chron. Camerac. cap. 52: *Genus humanum ab initio trifarium divisum esse monstravit, in oratoribus, agricultoribus, pugnatoribus.*" This is interesting, but not of very much assistance. I should suspect that the sentiment in the riming form might be found in one of the Latin Fathers, perhaps in AUGUSTINE or in one of his admiring successors, like ISIDORE of Seville. Against this it may be said that *laborator* is scarcely so early, and that it may even be post-Alfredian. Upon this supposition, ALFRED'S English words may be based upon such unriming forms as those in BALDRICUS, quoted above. The use of a riming triad in *-ator* is, however, Ciceronian: *aut bellatori, aut imperatori, aut oratori* ('Tusc. Disp.' 4, 24, 53). From him the jingle may have been borrowed and modified by some well-read writer of the earlier Christian centuries.

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

THE FRENCH LITERATURE OF LOUISIANA IN 1889 and 1890.

II.

THE articles which appeared in the *Comptes Rendus de l'Athénée* in 1890 are of a character more varied than in 1889. The first paper which attracts our attention is an "Etude sur Robert-Edouard Lee," by Mr. G. DOUSSAN. The author evidently studied his subject carefully, and has rendered full justice to the great Confederate chieftain. Let us be thankful to Mr. DOUSSAN for presenting to us a very interesting picture of a man whose memory is honored by every American, and who, in the opinion of many, is the most perfect character in our history since Washington.

"Le Pugilat chez les Anciens et les Modernes," by Dr. ALFRED MERCIER, gives us an account of prize-fighting among the ancients, and describes the terrible duel between Epeos and Euryalos, in the twenty-third book of the Iliad, and the combat of Dares and Entellus,

in the fifth book of the Æneid. However horrible and brutal those fights of the ancients appear to us, in spite of the beautiful verses of the greatest masters of antiquity, we must remember that they were the outcome of a civilization in which physical force and skill were of the greatest use in battle. Now, however, as the Doctor remarks, men are killed in wars at great distances, and physical strength, as exemplified by the combats described by HOMER and VIRGIL, is no longer necessary. Let boxing, therefore, be considered an hygienic exercise, and let us not adore, as did the Greeks, athletes whose brutal exhibitions are demoralising and revolting to our sense of delicacy.

Dr. MERCIER, who has made a special study of the Creole patois and who uses it with great charm in his novels, has translated several of Æsop's fables into our Louisiana patois. He gives the fables imitated by LA FONTAINE, and shows that those of Æsop translated into the naïve and sweet Creole patois are not unworthy to be compared with those of the great fabulist of the seventeenth century.

The following fables are really charming and quaint in their new garb:

COMPER RENAR.

Comper Renar entré dan ain boutic comédi-en, é fouillé dan tou so bitin. Li trouvé ain mask ki té joliman bien faite; li pran li dan so patte, é li di comme ça: "Ki bel latéte! main pa gagnin la cervel laddan."

CIGAL É FROUMIS.

Dan tan liver froumis tapé fé sécher grain diblé ki té umide. Ain cigal ki té bien faim mandé yé kichoge pou mangé. Froumis layé réponne: "Dan tan lété cofer vou pa serré kèke nourriture?" Mamzel Cigal di yé: "Mo té pa gagnin tan; mo té toujours apé chanté." Froumis parti rire, é di li: "Dan tan cho vou té chanté; asteur fé frette, vou dansé."

In "Paracelse" Dr. MERCIER places before us the famous and enigmatic physician, and makes him relate to us his dream while under the influence of the powerful essence discovered by him. Dolor, Aphrodité, Invidia, Avaritia, Politica, Jocosa speak to him in vain; he only heeds Pallas Athéné, who leads him to her temple, and then he converses with Vita, Fides, Novitas and Mors, and although devoted to Scientia, he receives Poesis as his

best friend. This allegory, although fantastic, is written with great force, and the language of Paracelse is poetic and harmonious.

Dr. MERCIER published also in pamphlet form a long philosophical poem, "Réditus et Ascalaphos." Réditus seeks solitude, and has taken refuge in a lofty tower built upon a rock. He has fled from the society of man and believes that he is alone in his eagle's nest, when he hears a voice near him in the darkness. He then perceives in the light of the moon an old and gigantic owl. It is Ascalaphos, whom the wrath of Ceres and Persephone has metamorphosed, and who has been condemned by the goddesses to live forever. He has a long conversation with Réditus, in which he expounds to the latter the history and destiny of mankind. The bird of night then takes his flight towards Africa, into the interior of which the white man is at last penetrating, and Réditus exclaims in verses really grand:

"Il a pris son essor. Quels vigoureux coups d'aile!
Il va plus promptement que la prompte hirondelle.
Il est déjà bien loin. Ce n'est plus qu'un point noir;
A peine si mes yeux peuvent encore le voir.
Dans une vapeur d'or il plonge, et la lumière
L'absorbe. Je le cherche en vain dans l'atmosphère:
Plus rien. Oh! si j'avais des ailes comme lui,
J'irais revoir le ciel où mes beaux jours ont lui,
Les jours d'enchantement, d'espérance et d'ivresse,
Les jours si fugitifs de l'heureuse jeunesse,
Mais ne regrettons rien. Laissons s'évanouir
L'image d'un passé qui ne peut revenir."

That the women of Louisiana are good writers of French was demonstrated again in 1890, when, at the literary contest of the Athénée, two ladies won the prizes for the best essays. Miss THÉRÉSA BERNARD's paper on "Joseph de Maistre" evinced great maturity of thought, expressed in a style energetic and clear; and Mrs. S. DE LA HOUSSE's light sketches were poetic and graceful.

Dr. DELL'ORTO contributes to the *Comptes-Rendus* some interesting translations from the Italian. We feel pained at the sad death of Toto, the *onistiti* who dies of sorrow because he has broken to pieces his lady-love, the porcelain *monachella*.

Mr. PEYTAVIN presents the result of important researches made by him upon the vicissitudes of the theatre in Richmond during the

war, and renders justice to the energy and love for his art of ORSY OGDEN, who, in spite of numberless obstacles, managed to keep his theatre open until the fall of the capital of the Confederacy.

Mr. GEORGE DESSOMMES' "La Légende d'Oreste" is a scholarly piece of work. The author makes a comparative study of the Oresteia in AESCHYLUS, SOPHOCLES and EURIPIDES, and gives a clear idea of the differences in the genius of the great Greek dramatists.

"Autriche-Hongrie," by Mr. FRANZ KUPETZ, is an interesting account of the present condition of the Empire of FRANCIS JOSEPH, and "Citrus trifoliata," by Dr. DEVRON, is a scientific botanical study.

Mr. E. GRIMA wrote in 1890 several light and graceful poems: "Pourquoi Jean est resté garçon" is witty and amusing, and "Elégie" is very touching.

DOMINIQUE ROUQUETTE, perhaps the best and most original poet that Louisiana has produced, died in May, 1890. I devoted a few pages in the *Comptes-Rendus de l'Athénée* to the memory of the old bard of the Tchefuncté. I will close by reproducing here one of his delicate and tender poems.

A MME. ADÈLE C***

"Dites, avez-vous vu, comme souvent je vois,
Sur les pieux vermoulus, au rebord des vieux toits,
Une plante flétrie et réduite en poussière?
Dites, avez-vous vu la sauvage fougère,
Desséchée aux rayons de nos soleils d'été,
Sur un hangar croulant, tombant de vétusté?....
La plante qu'à regret quelque pieu tremblant porte,
Fanée, étiolée, à nos yeux semble morte;
Balancée au rebord du vieux hangar mouvant,
Ce n'est qu'un peu de poudre abandonnée au vent:
Mais qu'une fraîche ondée inattendue arrive,
Laisant couler sur elle une goutte d'eau vive;
La plante, bénissant le torrent bienfaiteur,
Recouvre sa verdure et toute sa fraîcheur:
Ainsi, dans notre cœur qu'un tourbillon emporte,
Dans nos cœurs oubliés, l'amitié semble morte,
Mais le doux souvenir, la ranimant parfois,
Lui donne la beauté, la fraîcheur d'autrefois."

The French literature of Louisiana is no unworthy daughter of that of France, and will long continue to live; it is modest and simple, but above all, sincere.

ALCÉE FORTIER.

Tulane University of Louisiana.

LE CIMETIÈRE DU VILLAGE.

(Traduit de l'anglais de T. GRAY.)

Du jour qui va mourir le beffroi dit le glas ;
 Les troupeaux mugissants contournent la prairie ;
 Le laboureur au nid revient à pesants pas,
 La nuit reprend la terre, et le sommeil la vie.

Du paysage ardent s'effacent les tons d'or,
 Et dans l'air assoupi que le silence enchaîne,
 L'on n'entend que le chant du bourdon qui s'endort,
 Ou les bruits des bercaïls sommeillant dans la plaine.

Ou bien encor le cri du hibou gémissant,
 Qui, du haut de sa tour, au vert manteau de lierre,
 Vient se plaindre à son Dieu de l'indiscret passant,
 Qui veut troubler son règne antique et solitaire.

Sous ces ormes rugueux, à l'ombre de ces ifs,
 Où s'élèvent partout les tertres funéraires,
 Dans la tombe chouchés, à jamais inactifs,
 Du tranquille hameau dorment les simples pères.

Du matin embaumé l'appel vivifiant.
 L'oiseau qui dit sa note, abrité sous la paille,
 Le cri perçant du coq, le cor retentissant.
 Ne les appellent plus à la rude bataille.

Elle est morte pour eux la flamme du foyer,
 Pour eux ne veille plus l'active ménagère,
 L'enfant sur leurs genoux, cueillant son doux baiser,
 N'ira plus bégayer l'accueil de la chaumière.

Que de fois sous leur faux ont plié les moissons !
 Comme leur soc ouvrait une terre obstinée !
 Comme ils menaient joyeux l'attelage aux sillons !
 Comme les bois tombaient aux coups de leur cognée !

Respectez, orgueilleux, leur utile labeur,
 Leur bonheur innocent, leur destinée obscure ;
 Gardez-vous d'accueillir d'un sourire moqueur
 De leurs simples récits la naïve lecture.

La pompe du blason, le faste de nos rois,
 Tout ce qui de la main de la fortune tombe,
 Reconnaît de la mort les rigoureuses lois :—
 Le sentier des honneurs ne conduit qu'à la tombe.

Et vous, ambitieux, ne leur en voulez pas,
 Si le marbre à leurs os refuse ses trophées,
 Où sous l'immense nef les pompeux hosannas
 Vont ébranler la voûte aux voix des coryphées.

L'urne aux inscriptions, et le buste vivant,
 Peuvent-ils raviver le souffle qui sommeille ?
 Ou la louange ardente, au pathétique accent,
 De nos morts endormis charmer la froide oreille ?

Qui sait si, dans ce lieu, perdu parmi les bois,
 Ne gît un cœur rempli du céleste délire ;
 Des mains pouvant porter le grand sceptre des rois,
 Ou ravir tout un monde aux accords de la lyre ?

Mais le savoir, chargé des dépouilles des ans,
 N'ouvrit jamais pour eux son livre plein de flamme,
 La froide pauvreté, réprimant leurs élans.
 Glâça dans leur essor les transports de leur âme.

Plus d'un joyau sans prix, de l'éclat le plus pur,
 Demeure enseveli dans les mers insondables ;
 Plus d'une fleur éclot dans quelque coin obscur
 Pour jeter ses parfums aux vents déserts des sables.

Quelque Hampden rustique, au courage obstiné,
 Implacable ennemi de toute tyrannie,
 Un Milton inconnu là peut-être est couché,
 Un Cromwell innocent du sang de sa patrie.

De sénats attentifs s'attirent les bravos,
 De ruine et de mort mépriser les menaces,
 Répandre l'abondance au sein des verts hameaux,
 Et d'un nom glorieux lire partout les traces,

Ne fut pas leur destin : En bornant leur vertu,
 Le sort leur interdit d'être grands par le crime,
 De monter au pouvoir par le sang répandu,
 De refuser la grâce à l'homme leur victime,

D'étouffer dans le cœur ses élans vers le vrai,
 De céler les rougeurs d'une honte ingénue,
 D'entasser sur l'autel du grand luxe éhonté,
 Un encens que la Muse à ses fils distribue.

Loin du peuple en furie et loin de ses débats,
 Leurs modestes désirs jamais ne s'écarterent ;
 Dans les rians vallons, témoins de leurs ébats,
 Ils vécurent sans bruit et sans bruit les quittèrent.

A leurs os toutefois pour servir de rempart,
 Un frêle monument dont l'âge fait le charme,
 Orné de vers grossiers, de sculptures sans art,
 Y demande au passant le tribut d'une larme.

Leurs âges que la muse y grave avec amour,
 Remplacent l'élégie aux paroles de flamme ;
 Et bien des textes saints, qu'elle a semés autour,
 Y préparent le sage à rendre à Dieu son âme.

Car quel est l'homme, en proie à l'oubli destructeur,
 Qui sut jamais quitter cette attachante vie,
 Laisser la chaude enceinte où lui vint le bonheur,
 Sans jeter en arrière un long regard d'envie ?

Sur quelque cœur aimant l'âme compte au départ,
 L'œil qui se ferme a droit au don de quelques larmes ;
 Mort, d'affections l'homme encore veut sa part,
 Et d'un bonheur enfui sentir toujours les charmes.

Pour toi, qui te souviens de nos morts dédaignés,
 Qui t'es fait de leur vie un fidèle interprète,
 Si, dans ces lieux, par la rêverie amenés,
 De sympathiques cœurs s'informent du poète :—

Des vieux aux cheveux blancs peut-être leur diront :
 Nous l'avons vu souvent, au lever de l'aurore,
 Foulaient d'un pas hâtif les humides gazons,
 Devancer sur le mont l'astre chéri de Flore.

Au pied de ce vieux hêtre, incliné par le temps,
Qui fait monter si haut ses bizarres racines,
Souvent il s'étendait, pensif et nonchalant,
Contemplant le ruisseau qui fuit sous les collines.

Tout auprès de ce bois, qui rit comme en mépris,
Il errait, murmurant ses fantasques pensées,
Soucieux, abattu, languissant, indécis,
Victime, aurait-on dit, d'espérances brisées.

Sur la bruyère, au pied de l'arbre qu'il aimait,
Un jour on le chercha; mais la place était vide,
Mais au bord de ce bois, où naguère il errait,
On n'entendait plus fuir que le ruisseau limpide.

Le lendemain, en deuil, avec des chants de mort,
Nous le vîmes porter le long du cimetière:
Approche et lis (toi qui sais lire) ce qu'alors
Sous cette vieille épine on grava sur la pierre.

L'EPITAPHE.

Ici repose, avec la terre pour tombeau,
Un jeune homme oublié de la fortune amie:
La Muse avec faveur l'accueillit au berceau;
Il fut l'enfant gâté de la mélancolie.

Généreux de nature et sincère de cœur,
Le ciel à ses bienfaits pesa la récompense;
Il donna ce qu'il eut (une larme au malheur),
Il obtint un ami pour prix de sa constance.

Laissez dans le tombeau, ce fut son dernier vœu,
Descendre son mérite et dormir ses faiblesses:
Dans le sein de son père et le sein de son Dieu,
Ils attendent tremblants l'effet de ses promesses.

J. BOÏELLE.

Dulwich College, London.

OLD FRENCH *abomer* AND *abosmer*.

THE purpose of this note is to point out that these two O. Fr. forms, which have ever since the time of DU CANGE been considered as standing for one and the same word, are in reality two words, distinct both in origin and use. The case is so simple as scarcely to call for more than an orderly disposition of the facts. No new etymology is here offered, though the correctness is tested of what I supposed to be a new etymology, before finding it recorded, where least to have been expected, in the collection of LA CURNE DE SAINTE PALAYE.

1. *Abomer* has from the first been correctly referred to Lat. ABOMINARI (for which PLAUTUS has a collateral active form ABOMINARE).

In the proper sense of Mod. Fr. *abominer* it occurs, so far as I have been able to discover, only once: Cambridge Psalter v, 5, "Hume de sancs e tricheur *abomerat* nostre Sire (Virum sanguinum et dolosum *abominabitur* Dominus)"—incidentally referred to by DIEZ, E. W., iic, s. v. *abomé*.¹

GODEFROY, however, cites two examples of its derivative verbal noun *abosme*,² with corresponding meaning: "Cil qui la veoient de loing avoient grant *abosme* de lui veoir."

And

A Dieu en vint si grant *abosme*
Que pour ce Gomorre et Sodome
Il fist toutes ardoir en cendre.

A specialized meaning of *abomer*, that of 'nauseare,' is noted by DU CANGE and later lexicographers as occurring in the "Miserere" of the RENCLUS DE MOILIENS:

Moult est en enfermeté grant,
Homs qui *abosme* (3) sa viande.

This again is the only occurrence of the word that I am able to cite with the meaning 'nauseare,' but it is abundantly supported by a corresponding use of the Low Lat. *abominatio*, O. Fr. *abomination*: "Cum homo antequam cibum accipiat, *abominationem* patiatur," etc.; and "La menthe . . . conforte l'estomac et donne apétit de mangier et oste *abomination* (DU CANGE, s. v. *abominatio*).

2. With the above *abomer* DU CANGE and subsequent lexicographers, with the exception of LA CURNE, have confounded the word *abosmer* 'to cast down, deject.' LA CURNE, on the other hand, is ignorant of *abomer* (=ABOMINARI), but has, as I believe, correctly explained *abosmer*. His treatment of the word (slightly abridged) is as follows:

"ABOSMER, *verbe*. Abysmer.

Précipiter dans un abyme, c'est le sens propre de ce mot, que nos anciens Auteurs, les Poètes surtout, employoient absolument et au figuré, pour exprimer la consternation, la dou-

¹ For the form cf. ALLUMINARE *alumer*, NOMINARE *nomer*, SEMINARE *semer*.

² GODEFROY has also an adjective, ABOSME 'plongé dans la douleur,' with the single citation, "Que j'ai le cuer *abosme* et triste." But this is evidently the past participle *abosmé* (treated in the present article under 2.), with crasis of final *e* and initial *e*.

³ Spelt *abome* in another citation of the same passage by GODEFROY from a different manuscript.

leur profonde dans laquelle un événement malheureux précipite, absorbe notre âme. "De quoy toute la Chevalerie fut *abosmée* et courroucée." . . . On disoit au même sens "avoir le cuer *abosmé*." . . . Ce mot, en se rapprochant de l'acception propre, s'est dit de soldats effrayés qui se précipitent, se renversent les uns sur les autres en fuyant :

S'en vont a Gisors entassant
Comme ceus cui paour *abosme*.

Nous n'oserions pas assurer qu' *abysmer* est le même qu' *abosmer*, si nous n'avions des preuves que l'*o* s'est mis quelquefois au lieu de l'*i*. Pour marinier, on disoit maronier."

The nature of the substitution of *o* for *i* here spoken of is scientifically more interesting and more demonstrable than LA CURNE could have suspected. It has been happily elucidated in the introduction to MEYER-LÜBKE's 'Romance Grammar,' § 17. Briefly expressed, the popular Latin, having no sound equivalent to Greek *v*, was accustomed to replace it by *y*; and this practice continued among the people even towards the end of the Republic, when the lettered Romans had in general adopted for Greek *v* the sound *ii*, represented by *y*. Accordingly we find a certain number of Romance words, from the Greek, offering an *o* (=Lat. *y*) for Greek *v*, while the majority show *i* or *y*. For cases of *o* for *v* cf. Ital. *borsa*, Fr. *bourse*=βύρσα; Ital. *grotta*, O. Fr. *crote*=κρύπτει, and a number of others. *Abosmer* is thus to be regarded as simply a doublet of *abimer*, by which it was early crowded out of the language. This is apparently the only example of doublets involving a divergent treatment of Greek *v*.

As to the occurrence of this word, GODEFROY has four examples of its use in finite forms, in addition to the passage cited by LA CURNE (including one example of reflexive use); but for the participial adjective *abosmé* 'plongé dans la douleur, etc.' he has some twenty citations, of which it is interesting to note that nine contain the word in immediate connection with *dolant*: *dolant et abosmé*, showing that it had come to be used as a conventional epithet.

3. By the side of *abosmer* occurs *abosmir*, which is evidently a collateral formation. GODEFROY has it only as an "adjective," *abosmi*, with five examples similar to those

under the past part. *abosmé*, three of which are connected with *dolant*, e. g.:

Et chevauche dolans et *abosmis*.

But the occurrence of a 3d sing. pres., *abomist*, is noted by VAN HAMEL, 'Renclus de Moiliens,' p. 135, v, 2, as a variant to *abosme* in the verse above cited:

Hom ki *abosme* sa viande.

4. There is another verb *abosmer* given by LA CURNE and by GODEFROY in the form of its past part. *abosmé*, the discussion of which involves again an interesting question concerning another pair of homonyms. LA CURNE treats this word as follows:

ABOSMÉ, *participe*. Abonné.

Laurière observe que *Bosme*, en Nivernois, signifie une borne. Dans ce cas *abosmé* et *aboumé* peuvent bien ne pas être des fautes dans la Coutume de Nevers, comme l'a cru l'Editeur, qui dans ses notes en marge, dit qu'il faut corriger *abonné* ou *abourné*. On y lit: gens de condition *abosmez*, c'est-à-dire *abournez* à certaine taille." (Laur. 'Gloss. du Dr. fr.')

It thus appears that GODEFROY recognizes the existence of *bosme* and *abosmer*. There is accordingly the less reason for his rejecting, as he does, s. v., the form *abommage* (which would be the natural derivative of this *abosmer*), and setting up in its stead a form *abonage*, which is apparently quite unwarranted.

GODEFROY remarks, s. v. 2. ABOSMER:

Coquille a observé, sur ce passage ["*abosmez* à certaine taille"], que dans sa province, *bosme* signifie une borne, en sorte qu'un territoire *abosmé* est un territoire contigu et renfermé dans de certaines bornes.

The natural hypothesis that *bosme* is the same word as *borne* is favored negatively by the apparent absence of any other explanation, and to some extent positively by the phonology of the two words. The etymology of *borne* is satisfactorily given by DIEZ as Mid. Lat. *BODINA* > *bodne* > *borne* and *bonne* (often spelt *bosné*). The change of *bosne* to *bosme* may possibly be explained as similar to that of *pruna* to *pruma* (MEYER-LÜBKE, Gr. § 452)—whence Ger. *Pflaume*, Eng. *plum*; but was more probably brought about by ignorant association and confusion of *abosner* with *abosmer*.

It remains to consider the relations of this word *abonner* (*abosner*, *aborner*) to Mod. Fr. *abonner*. DIEZ's article on the latter word ('E. W.' ii^c) reads:

Abonner fr. auf ein unbestimmtes einkommen einen bestimmten preis setzen, *s'abonner* sich als theilhaber an etwas unterschreiben; von *bonus* gut, bürgend, vgl. sp. *abonar*, bürgen, gut heissen, versichern. Man leitet es ohne noth von *bonne* gränze.

Neither LITTRÉ nor SCHELER accedes to this view, the former rejecting altogether the derivation from *bonus*, the latter admitting it as equally possible with the other. From a careful comparison of the early uses of *abonner* I believe it will appear that the word presents a merging of *AD-BODINARE and *AD-BONARE. For the meaning 'delimit' (*AD-BODINARE) no example could be more conclusive than the following from FROISSART, 'Chroniques' xi, 311 (cited by Godefroy): "Et furent adont et par bonne traitié deportis, devises et abonnées les deux roiaulmes de Portingal et de Castille."—For the meaning 'guarantee' (*AD-BONARE) compare (from GODEFROY):

Mol lit, blans dras et chambre bonne
Ayse de bien dormir *abonne*.

Summing up the above results, we should have the following series of equations:

1. *abomer*=ABOMINARI;
2. *abosmer*=*ABYSMARE;
3. *abosmir*=*ABYSMIRE;
4. $\begin{cases} \textit{abonner} \\ \textit{abosmer} \end{cases} = \begin{cases} *AD-BODINARE, \\ *AD-BONARE. \end{cases}$

H. A. TODD.

THE ETYMOLOGY OF ENGLISH 'TOTE.'

AMONG my earliest recollections is the use of the word *tote*. It is a word in use everywhere in the South and signifies both 'to bring' and 'to carry,' especially on one's head or shoulders. A Virginian, "F. W.," in a recent number of *The Critic*, has been trying to rescue this and another word, *raised*, "from the ridicule that now surrounds them." The word *tote*, he says, is properly "tolt" from "tollo," a term in common use at the English bar, from 1600 to the middle of the century, for lifting or removing a writ from one court to

another, and thence applied at large to the lifting of any object." As "F. W." observes, WEBSTER has no more to say of this word than "probably of African origin." This conjecture is possibly due to its frequent use by the Negroes. But this use is not confined to them. From *American Notes and Queries* for February 7, 1891, we find that it is very common not only "in Kentucky and Indiana" but also "all along the Ohio and Mississippi rivers," and in the next issue of the same journal "C. H. A." states that *tote* is in common use all through the State of Maine, where its meaning is 'to carry.' To this note I will refer again, as the usage of this word in Maine substantiates, I think, my proposed etymology.

This waif of the South presents an interesting view of the working of the human mind. The first approach to its origin is in the word *tout*, now confined to race courses. In horse-racing a *tout* is one who clandestinely watches the trials of race-horses at their training quarters, and for a fee gives information for betting purposes. Another spelling is *toot*, and English literature affords many examples of this word where it means 'to pry or search, peep about.' Two of these will suffice:

"For birds in bushes *tooting*." SPENSER'S 'Shepherds' Kalendar,' March, l. 66.

"Marking, spying, looking, *tooting*, watching like subtle, crafty and sleight fellows." LATIMER, 'Sermons' fol. 88.

In older authors, contemporary with and before CHAUCER, it was spelled *tote*, and FAIRFAX in his translation of TASSO follows this spelling:

"Nor durst Orcano view the soldans face,
But still upon the ground did pore and *tote*."

In 'Pierce the Plowman's Crede' we find several examples of *tote*, where it means 'to see clearly, look out, spy round, peep out': "to *toten* all abouten," l. 168: and "his ton *toteden* out," l. 426.

LANGLAND, in 'Piers the Ploughman,' uses it in the sense of 'to look, view':

"And bad me *toten* on the tree." B. xvi, 22;

and it is found in several other writings of this period with the same meaning.

This form *toten* is derived from Old English

totian, 'to project, stick out,' of which only one example is found:

ða heafdu totodun ut, 'the heads project out.' GREGORY'S 'Past. Care.' c. xvi, p. 104. From this unique example we get at the etymology of the word; for it is connected with Old Dutch *tuyt*, *tote*, 'a teat' = Old High German *tutta*, the same = Icelandic *tuta* 'a peak' (cf. English *Tothill*, 'a lookout hill') = Swedish *tut*, 'a point,' = Danish *tude*, 'a spout.' "The original sense," as SKEAT tells us, "was 'to project,' hence, 'to put out one's head, peep about, look all around,' and finally 'to tout for custom.'" But this is not the end, for here comes in our usage of *tote*. "The tradesmen of Tunbridge Wells," NARES tells us, "were used formerly to hunt out customers on the road, at their arrival, and hence they were called *tooters*." Then as now, as soon as a *tooter* secured a passenger, he doubtless took his baggage and carried it to the inn for him, and hence arose the use of *tote* 'to carry.' This conjecture I had made before I saw "C. H. A.'s" note in *American Notes and Queries* for February 14, 1891, which I think confirms it. He says: "Roads to lumber camps, and over which supplies to the camp were carried, are always called *tote roads*, and the teamsters are called *toters*. To *tote* a thing from one place to another is in familiar use all through the State [Maine], so far as I have travelled." We thus see that *tote* is not "probably of African origin," nor is it "from *tollo*," nor is it a Southernism or even an Americanism. But, like almost all other colloquialisms in the United States, it has a good English and Teutonic ancestry.

W. M. BASKERVILL.

Vanderbilt University.

A THEORY FOR THE ORIGIN OF A COMMON IDIOM.

IT is interesting to observe the wide-spread use of the possessive (apostrophe and *s*) after the preposition *of*. I cite a few instances that have come under my notice within the last few days:

"These words of Emerson's may be called to mind."—N. Y. *Nation*, March 19, 1891.

"A better remark of Vespasian's deserves to be as well-known as it is."—*Littell's Liv-*

ing Age, March 14, 1891. (*National Review*).

Short Cuts has unearthed a peculiarly delightful letter of the Duke of Wellington's.—*Littell's Living Age*, March 14, 1891. (*Spec. tator*).

"A great saying of Joubert's.—PATER'S 'The Renaissance,' p. 45.

"That quaint design of Botticelli's."—*ib.*, p. 61.

"Pictures like this of Botticelli's.—*ib.*, p. 61.

Finally, the heading of a lyric by ARTHUR SYMONS in *The Athenæum*: "For a picture of Watteau's."—*Littell's Living Age*, March 21, 1891.

There have been various explanations for this construction. It has been considered due to mere euphony, or to the emphasis of the idea of the subjective relation, or to the existence of a feeling that an associated word is understood in thought, or (treating it historically) to an imitation and extension of such expressions as "a friend of mine." These last pronominal constructions are used only when a modifier such as *a*, *any*, *every*, *no*, etc., precedes the noun (cf. EINENKEL, 'Streifzüge' pp. 85-6), and are very different in thought and in feeling from others, like "for the life of me," associated with a negative.

So far as I have been able to observe, this use of the possessive after the preposition *of* seems to have its origin in cases where a plural noun or a class term may be inserted in thought and the preceding modifying word indicates that only a part of the whole is taken. The construction is therefore akin to that of the partitive genitive. For instance, in the above examples, there are many words and sayings of EMERSON and JOUBERT, many pictures painted by BOTTICELLI and WATTEAU, VESPASIAN made many remarks, and WELLINGTON wrote many letters—and in all these cases there is brought to our notice only *one* (except in the first, and this deals with *a few*).

True, in an example like the last ("a picture of Watteau's"), the possessive form may be accounted for as used to avoid ambiguity and to emphasize the subjective relation, since "a picture of Watteau" would more naturally signify one *representing* WATTEAU. This ambiguity finds its explanation not so much in

the varied uses and meanings of the preposition *of*, as in the character and meaning of the word *picture* (picture = *pictura* from *pingere* 'to paint,' and the phrase following would be naturally treated as an objective genitive taking the place of the object of the verb); and the same distinction is true with other words denoting a representation, sketch, etc.

Usage admits all these examples, but we have hardly gone so far as to accept (though even this may be heard) "the house of Mr. Smith's," where Mr. Smith's residence—and he has only one—is intended. The distinction is much the same as where we allow "that friend of mine" = that one of my friends, but should be inclined to reject "the friend of mine," if the main thought be that only one friend exists. Similarly, on this principle, "that husband of mine" would be an exception,¹ and its origin, as is the case with much slang, was probably due to a desire to catch the public eye and ear with something striking and uncommon. However, this expression—the title of a novel, I believe—serves well to show the extension and growth of a construction once fixed in the language. So, "this business of John's," which I note in GEORGE MACDONALD'S 'The Flight of the Shadow,' seems to be a slight extension of the original use and may be explained by analogy. But I think that even here the main idea underlying is the partitive one; for there are many matters and interests attaching to John, and this particular one, being important, is emphasized and is abstracted from the rest.

This distinction, then, of the singular, the particular, the individual *versus* the plural, the general, the class, seems to be the principle which underlies the history of the idiom and which determines at present where the line is drawn. But that we may go in time beyond this, in the colloquial as well as in the written language, in our use of double genitives (cf. *ours*, *yours*, *theirs*, etc.), as in double plurals, comparatives, superlatives, and even negatives, seems likely enough. At least, he would be bold who should predict too positively for the future.

JOHN BELL HENNEMAN.

Hampden-Sidney College.

¹ Even here this *one* may be considered distinguished from all *other* husbands.

LATIN DRAMA IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance von WILHELM CLOETTA. I. Komödie und Tragödie im Mittelalter. Halle, 1890. 8vo, pp. xi, 167. Price, 4 marks.

THE silence of CLOETTA, since he won his literary spurs by the publication of the "Poème Moral," is abundantly atoned for by the valuable and interesting pages of these *Beiträge*. The present volume, the author assures us in his Preface, is but an introduction (which had gradually grown beyond the limits of a chapter) to a study of the Renaissance tragedy in Italy, already in MS., which study in turn forms but a part of a general survey of the Renaissance tragedy in Europe—a series that will materially aid in the understanding of the drama in the vernacular from the beginning of the sixteenth century.

The *Beiträge* begin with a sketch of the decline of Latin classical drama under the Empire, the crowding out of comedy by the pantomime, and the disfavor shown towards tragedy by the waning literary life. By the last part of the fourth century the play which passes under the name of "Aulularia," or "Querolus," revealed in its structure that the very notion of dramatic verse was entirely lost, while the "Orestis Tragoedia" of the fifth century, though it discloses a knowledge of SENECA'S plays, is in fact an epic poem and not a tragedy at all. Its title is based on the material out of which it was constructed and not on its form. The poem "Medea," by the same author, DRACONTIUS, contains the same elements as "Orestes," but is not called a tragedy.

If this ignorance existed at the fall of the Empire, it is plain that the Middle Ages were not particularly enlightened regarding the principles of dramatic art. TERENCE they knew, and the "Querolus," which was thought to be written by PLAUTUS, but no tragedies, not even those of SENECA. Nor was additional information gained before the discoveries of the thirteenth century. An interesting illustration of this state of affairs is seen in the numerous commentaries on BOETHIUS' "De Consolatione." BOETHIUS himself understood as yet the theatre of the ancients, but his anno-

tators of the ninth and tenth centuries, not to mention those who came later, no longer appreciated or rightly interpreted his literary references. The same is true of ISIDORE OF SEVILLE and his mediæval commentators. Tragedy was considered to be a narrative poem of serious content, and by the eleventh century no less an authority than PAPIAS regarded the first eclogue of VERGIL as an excellent scenic composition.

What then were tragedy and comedy in the eyes of the men of the time? From a study of the treatises on the subject and of the works which bore the names of tragedy and comedy, CLOETTA arrives at a very definite conclusion. Tragedy, on the one hand, was a name applied to any piece of literature, generally in verse, which began happily in plot but ended sadly; while comedy, on the other hand, began sadly and ended happily. Tragedy also demanded theoretically a noble style and royal personages for its characters, while comedy should be cast in the style of ordinary life and should relate the affairs of the lower born. A treatise on poetry by JOHANNES DE GARLANDIA, written about 1260, would indicate that a comedy should have five acts.

Some ten years earlier than this work, however, that great compilation of mediæval learning, the 'Speculum Historiale' of VINCENT DE BEAUVAIS, reveals a wider knowledge of the ancient stage. Its author cites from the six comedies of TERENCE and, what is more significant, from the ten tragedies ascribed to SENECA, which must have been but recently brought to light, since no other writer alludes to them before DANTE—in his letter (1316 or 1317) to Can Grande della Scala, dedicating to him the first cantos of the "Paradiso.") In this letter, as is well known, DANTE shares the general conception of the Middle Ages regarding tragedy and comedy. He calls his great trilogy a "Comedy," because "Comedy is a certain kind of poetic narration" which "begins with adversity in something, but its matter ends prosperously;" and which is "unstudied and ordinary" in style . . . being "in the vulgar tongue." (SCAR-TAZZINI'S 'Hand-book to Dante,' translated by DAVIDSON, pp. 275-276.) Tragedy is the counterpart of comedy, as we have seen above.

Throughout all the fourteenth century dramatic performances (in Latin and among the learned, it must be remembered) consisted in a mere recitation of the poem or even in pantomime acting. BOCCACCIO, alluding to the subject in his commentary on DANTE, would have only the leading rôle spoken by the author, the minor rôles given in mimicry. For this conception, which seems to have been general, ISIDORE OF SEVILLE was doubtless responsible. Furthermore BOCCACCIO's notion of comedy is exemplified in the title which he gave at first to his "Ameto," (*Commedia delle Ninfe fiorentine*); and the common view of tragedy is again seen in CHAUCER'S "Monk's Tale," which passed under that head, as did also his "Troilus and Crysseyde." Here the definition goes back to BOETHIUS. Thus LYDGATE laments the death of CHAUCER, as that of a writer of tragedies and comedies. Not only in France, Italy and England was this position held in regard to the classification of mediæval literature, but also in Spain, where the MARQUIS OF SANTILLANA (†1458) repeats the same statement. As has been already said, all these writers followed simply in the steps of ISIDORE and BOETHIUS.

Leaving now the definitions of comedy and tragedy, CLOETTA brings forward the mediæval etymologies of the words, as illustrative of the manner in which they were understood. *Comoedia* he finds derived from *Kômôios*=*commensatio*, and since the authorities, who go back to DONATUS, confuse *comoedus* and *comicus*, so *comoedia* was confused with *comedia* and was defined as a "coarse song of peasants" which gradually rose to the dignity of a "song sung at feasts." *Tragoedia* had no less evil a fate. HORACE'S statement that the goat was the reward of tragic poets was, in course of time, perverted to the notion that a tragedy was a goat's song, and, the goat being an unclean animal, that it was also a shameful song. But inasmuch as tragedy celebrated royalty, the mediæval wiseacres, put on their mettle, gravely compared it, in its commencement to the serious head of the goat, and in its ending to the less edifying hindquarters of the beast.

But notwithstanding all this childishness and absurdity the Middle Ages were not entirely devoid of drama patterned on the ancient

models. Besides the six plays in dialogue of the much-discussed and long-suffering HROTSWITH (ROSWITHA), who evidently chose TERENCE for her guide, the general testimony of the writers of the period shows that they admitted tragedy and comedy, in prose as well as in verse, in the restricted meaning of the present day. And in fact Latin plays were produced which bear no traces of the influence of the popular stage. Yet the dramatic instinct of an age which called the *'Æneid'* a tragedy and the *'Metamorphoses'* a comedy, cannot be relied on to create much literature of a purely theatrical character. To deal with the subject properly it will be necessary to discard these crude notions, which would separate all literature into tragedy and comedy, and to apply to the accessible scenic material the more limited classification of both ancient and modern science. The result of CLOETTA's investigation in this direction has been to rank the greater part of genuine mediæval tragedy and comedy under the head of "Epic Dramas." He applies this name to them, since, apart from the plays of HROTSWITH, the dramatic literature appears in the form of poems, generally in distichs, less often in hexameters, and offers ample evidence of having its source directly or indirectly in OVID, the great master of the scholars of that time.

Here CLOETTA interrupts his argument with the consideration of a prose work, "*De Casu Caesenæ*," written in Perugia by one Ser LODOVICO, in the year 1377. It is a narration, in which four persons share, of the massacre of the inhabitants of Cesena in that year, by the mercenaries of the Cardinal, ROBERT of Geneva. CLOETTA translates this story at length, arranging it in dialogue form. He finds in it both vigor and emotion. Since it is a discussion between men of low birth who have survived the events they relate, the conclusion is obvious that it is a comedy.

Resuming now the main exposition of the subject, the author treats of the examples of the epic dramas which can properly be called comedies. The oldest and best were written by VITALIS, possibly from Blois, before the middle of the twelfth century and perhaps as early as the eleventh. His first play bears the well-known title "*Amphitruon*," or "*Geta*," the

great success of which he followed up with a second, the "*Aulularia*," or "*Querulus*," which resembles strongly the play "*Querolus*" of the fourth century. The indirect source of VITALIS, the plays of PLAUTUS, would explain this likeness, and indicate in a general way the contents of VITALIS' poems. Their great popularity led to an imitation, the comedy "*Thraso*."

To this first group, which drew on antiquity for plot and episodes, succeeds a second series, mediæval in character. A representative of this class is the "*Alda*" of GUILLAUME DE BLOIS, written between 1160 and 1170. It combines with notions derived from the Latin poets, perhaps from TERENCE'S "*Eunuchus*," material of Oriental origin. The "*Alda*" was soon followed by the "*Comoedia di Milone Constantinopolitano*" of MATTHEW OF VENDOME, an Eastern story the scene of which is laid in the capital of the Eastern Empire. Both the "*Milo*" and the "*Alda*" are narratives of seduction, and they typify the general run of all these plays. A "*Miles gloriosus*," by an imitator of MATTHEW, is placed in Rome, and shows the same trend. "*Lydia*," by the same imitator, is the story which BOCCACCIO used, not much later, in his "*Decameron*" (vii, 9). In the twelfth century also are found the comedies "*Pamphilus Glisceria Birria*," more an account of travel, and "*De tribus sociis*," an anecdote of still less importance.

The above plays, in which the poetical part seems to have the better of the dramatic, are accompanied by others in which the narrative is presented in pure dialogue. The best specimen of the kind is the "*Comoedia Babionis*," belonging to the last quarter of the twelfth century, and very popular in England, as is witnessed by GOWER'S "*Confessio Amantis*." "*Babio*" is the story of a deceived husband who finally turns monk. It is taken from contemporary life. A play of much greater literary influence is the "*Pamphilus*" of the same period. This story of seduction was taken up in Spain by the "*Celestina*," and thus brought into contact with the drama in the vernacular. Its own source is apparently OVID. The short comedy "*De clericis et rustico*" relates how the peasant consumed the provisions of his

sleeping companions—a tale which was made use of in the “*Disciplina clericalis*.” More of a poem than a play is “*De Paulino et Polla*,” of the first part of the thirteenth century, located in Apulia and wholly coarse in character.

All the comedies hitherto mentioned were written in distichs. CLOETTA cites others, however, which consist wholly of hexameters. The most noteworthy one is in the “*Poetria*” of JOHANNES DE GARLANDIA, but neither this nor the others of like form seem intended for the stage. And this remark may apply to all the epic dramas, since, in the best of them, the rapid changes in time and place would preclude any possible stage-setting.

What is true of the comedies is also true of the few tragi-comedies, a name which CLOETTA applies to the story of the child begotten, during the husband's absence, by the snow (according to the mother), and melted later by the sun (according to the husband). This tale is the subject of two short poems, “*De Mercatore*” and “*De viro et uxore moecha*,” both of the twelfth century. Other examples of the kind might be cited bordering rather on poetry than on drama.

The same conditions apply as well to the epic tragedies of the Middle Ages, fewer in number than the comedies and less developed from the dramatic standpoint; undoubtedly therefore less popular, and yet of a higher character, since the comedies owed much of their success to their coarse episodes. The best epic tragedy is the “*Mathematicus*,” or “*Patricida*,” of BERTRAND DE CHARTRES, and written in the first part of the twelfth century. Its sub-title indicates the plot: a son destined to kill and to succeed his royal father. In the poem, however, the father abdicates in order to thwart destiny. The setting is that of Latin antiquity. The remaining tragedies, five in number, of which one is known only by name, are much inferior to “*Patricida*.” They draw as a rule from contemporary life. One, “*De Affra et Flavio*,” of the last part of the twelfth century, is on the unfounded jealousy of a husband who exposes his wife and child on a desert island, where hunger finally forces the mother to eat the son. MATTHEW OF VENDOME is perhaps the author of a “*Pyramus and Thisbe*.” A parody on tragedy is a Bel-

gian scene, composed by a certain RENERUS, of Brussels, in 1447; a wolf who has fallen into a pit with two men cannot, being dumb, excuse himself to the magistrates and therefore loses his life, while the men escape. These tragedies are in distichs, as was perhaps the lost “*De Flaura et Marco*,” ascribed by PIERRE DE BLOIS to his brother GUILLAUME. The “*Poetria*” of JOHANNES DE GARLANDIA preserves in hexameters a so-called “*Tragoedia*,” which in fact is not strictly a tragedy, since its characters are low-born, the main plot being the betrayal of a stronghold to the besiegers by a washerwoman.

Though there existed thus, as has been abundantly proven, a considerable body of dramatic literature, in the shape of epic dramas, it is doubtful whether any of it was ever put on the stage, as we understand that term. From a study of the evidence accessible, CLOETTA leans toward the opinion that the majority of these poems were read by one person only, but that in others one reader may have taken the part of the principal character and other readers the minor parts. This latter method, however, would obtain only in comedies, through the influence of TERENCE's plays and VERGIL's eclogues. Tragedies would be recited like a narrative poem.

It is remarkable how this conception of tragedy and comedy persisted in the Middle Ages, remaining, as we have seen, down into the fifteenth century, in spite of the revival of learning in Italy and the changed views of drama which the discovery of SENECA's tragedies must have brought about among the educated. To trace the awakening of a true understanding of the theatre will doubtless be the first step in the next volume of this series. We wish the painstaking and erudite author all success in carrying out his self-imposed task.

F. M. WARREN.

Johns Hopkins University.

FRENCH LEXICOGRAPHY.

Dictionnaire général de la langue française du commencement du xvii^e siècle jusqu'à nos jours, par ADOLPHE HATZFELD et ARSÈNE DARMESTETER, avec le concours de ANTOINE THOMAS. Paris: Ch. Delagrave. THE first four parts of this important work

now in course of publication, comprise, exclusive of the Introduction, the whole of the letter A, and B as far as *brouette*, or 304 pages in all. Its authors do not intend that it shall supplant the existing great dictionaries of the Academy and LITTRÉ, yet it will prove to most students a more useful work for everyday purposes. The ground covered is from the beginning of the seventeenth century to the present day; the intention is to exhibit the changes in language within that period and the causes of such changes. This involves necessarily something more than a tabulation of words, their meaning, and their etymology; namely, the clear exposition of the order in which the different meanings have successfully come into use.

The original meaning of a word is frequently recognized without difficulty in all its later developments, but many cases occur in which, at first sight, an inexplicable change is manifest. *Gagner* is cited as a typical example; its original meaning, *paitre* 'to feed,' has through a succession of extensions, perfectly clear when placed side by side, given the modern sense of 'to acquire.' The opposite case also presents itself: a narrowing of the idea and thus a restriction of the meaning, as in *menuisier* 'joiner,' originally applied to jewellers, locksmiths and others, as well. These are the two main forms of change, but there are further modes in which the mind has worked and which are noted by the authors. They adopt, to make clear this sequence of meanings, whether by extension or contraction, the plan of dividing the meanings into series and groups, or, to employ their own words, they consider a word of multiple meanings as constituting a genus, its more important significations as species, and its subordinate as varieties. The word *blanc* may be taken as an illustration of this system, or, still better, the preposition *à*, which will at once suggest to how much account the dictionary may be turned in teaching, where clear definitions are always the better of abundant illustrations. *Ajuster*, *âme*, *bilboquet*, *bouchon* furnish additional interesting examples.

The limits and nature of the work forbid the insertion within the dictionary proper of the exposition of the laws which regulate the

various changes; this exposition, which will certainly be a masterly one, is to be given in a "Traité de la formation de la langue," coming last in the order of publication, but intended to precede the dictionary part. Constant reference, by paragraph and number, is made to this Treatise in the separate articles, and the full value of the work as a whole can be properly estimated only when this part of it also is in the hands of scholars.

What words should be admitted in a dictionary of this sort? Those only, say the authors, which have a fixed use in the spoken or written tongue. This narrows the field of choice, and excludes, *e. g.*, local terms and expressions, scientific terms which have not come into ordinary use, and such neologisms as have not yet acquired *droit de cité*. Nevertheless, even in the parts already issued, there will be found many words not included in the last edition of the 'Dictionnaire de l'Académie'; these are marked with an asterisk, and are for the most part technical or scientific terms.

On the question of etymology the new dictionary may be accepted as stating the results of the latest investigations, as fully as is possible under the conditions governing the issue of so large a work and the concurrent and constant progress made in etymology. The etymology begins each article, instead of concluding it as in LITTRÉ, the plan of sequence of meanings rendering this change necessary, since the etymology gives the original signification from which all the others are derived. All the forms and meanings thus grouped are to be treated of again in the promised "Traité de la formation de la langue."

The authors are very careful to insert, wherever possible, the date of the first appearance of a word, and to indicate clearly all cases in which the derivation is yet in doubt. On this point of derivation they occasionally come in conflict even with LITTRÉ, to whom they express themselves chiefly indebted in many ways. A comparison of *aller*, *barre*, *bouée*, *blé*, *bourdon*, among others, will show the difference in treatment.

Particularly welcome to all students, but especially to teachers, is the attention paid to synonyms, which the authors divide into three great classes:—words analogous to each

other, such as *ployer* and *plier*; words modified, such as *jour* and *journée*, and words of wholly different origin to which custom has assigned a similarity of meaning—these being considered by DARMESTETER and HATZFELD the only true synonyms. Their warning to avoid sedulously the habit of defining a word of this class by giving its synonym, is much needed. It is apparently a saving of trouble to do this; in reality it is adding to the difficulty: to define *prendre* by *saisir* does not actually define the former any more than *renverser avec violence* defines *terrasser*, for, as well put in the Introduction, "on peut renverser avec violence une lampe, on ne la terrasse pas." The method recommended and employed by the authors is to bring forward examples in which the one synonym is regularly used, and in which the other is not and cannot be. Even then, of course, there may be some difficulty in making clear the exact shade of meaning of either word, but this is not admitted by the authors, who are sure that "an exact definition of each term, based upon the origin and history of the word, would cause so-called synonyms to disappear." One turns with interest, of course, to those two familiar words, *an*, *année*, for a practical application of the idea. They are thus treated:—

AN (étym., du lat. *annum*, m. s.)

1°. Durée d'une révolution de la terre autour du soleil, prise pour mesure du temps. (Ne s'emploie pas en astron.)

2°. Au plur. Les ans, le temps qu'on a vécu.

ANNÉE (du lat. pop. *annata*, dérivé de *annum*, an, devenu **annada*, **annade*, **annède*, *année*). Période qui embrasse soit une révolution de la terre autour du soleil, soit un certain nombre de mois lunaires, considérée non d'une manière absolue, mais quant à ce qui a lieu pendant sa durée.

I. Cette période déterminée astronomiquement, pour la mesure du temps.

II. Cette période déterminée par un certain ordre de faits qui la remplissent.

III. Un espace de douze mois, considéré par rapport à ce qui s'y passe, sans égard à l'époque où il commence.

|| *Spécialt.* Chaque espace de douze mois compté depuis la naissance d'une personne.
| Au plur. Les années, ce qui détermine l'âge d'une personne. | *Poét.* Les—, la vie.

This is but one example; numerous others will readily suggest themselves, and the study

of this branch of the work will assuredly prove interesting as well as instructive, thanks to the fulness and clearness with which it is treated—numerous well-chosen examples, drawn not from ordinary usage only but from texts also, being given in each case.

The use to be made of examples has been well understood by the authors; quotations from texts were indispensable if the history of the transformations and changes of words, both in form and meaning, was to be properly told; hence they have drawn liberally upon the writers of different ages, and though they treat only of French of the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, they have traced back the words, where necessary, to the Low Latin, "too much neglected hitherto." In doing this, and in quoting freely from the older authors, they have been careful "to take the words of an historical example in the sense of the author's time and not, as one is inclined to do, in their modern signification." Some of the ridiculous mistakes due to the latter cause are noted.

Pronunciation has also its share of attention, and the practice of the polite circles of Paris and of the *Comédie française* has been adopted. So far as arbitrary phonetic signs can convey an idea of the sound to be formed, those selected by DARMESTETER and HATZFELD will enable the pronunciation to be determined. Their pronunciation of liquid *l* differs from LITTRÉ's, as was to be expected; and that sound, as given by him, they believe will ere long wholly disappear. Other differences, slight, for the most part, will also be noted on perusal and comparison.

In conclusion, it may be said that the work promises to be just such an one as was looked for from the two eminent scholars whose names it bears, and that it will be indispensable to all who make more than a passing study of the language. It fulfils a function which the larger dictionaries do not; it presents similar facts in a different and often clearer way; to an American, especially, studying French it will prove, thanks to the admirable arrangement, a valuable help.

Mr. DARMESTETER has not lived to see the book published after the seventeen years of labor he bestowed on it with his colleague,

but the work of the Dictionary proper was done, and the plan and the greater part of the "Traité" written out. What was left unfinished of this will be completed by Mr. ANTOINE THOMAS, a former pupil of DARMESTETER's, who also assists Mr. HATZFELD in bringing the work up to date as it passes through the press.

The work is to be completed in thirty parts.

F. C. DE SUMICHRAST.

Harvard University.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

Ruy Blas, edited by HAROLD ARTHUR PERRY, M.A. Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, Editor of "Hernani." London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1890.

VICTOR HUGO, more from the greatness of his personality in French literature than from any special adaptability of his writings to college class-work, is necessarily destined to be the author around whom will centre a great deal of tutorial activity in modern literature. Standing, as he did at one time, as the champion of a movement which, in spite of all that may be said against its extravagances, wrought a most salutary influence in emancipating literary art from the trammels which had so long oppressed it, the author of 'Les Misérables' will consequently claim a large amount of attention in any, even the most cursory, review of French literature of the nineteenth century. Of HUGO's dramas, "Ruy Blas" and "Hernani" are likely to be the chief stand-bys for class-work, principally because of their intrinsic merits, as well as because they show less of the author's eccentricities than his other dramatic works; and of the two, "Ruy Blas" will always have the first choice where but one can be read. It is fitting, therefore, that suitable editions of these works should be prepared.

Professor W. I. KNAPP was the first, I believe, to publish the text of "Ruy Blas" in this country ('French Readings,' Ginn, Heath & Co., Boston, 1883). The annotations given were of the most meagre and imperfect kind, only such, in fact, as usually accompany such compilations as so-called "Readers." Hardly any attempt was made to elucidate the text or explain its many difficulties. About the same

date, but a little later, Miss RENA A. MICHAELS printed the text separately with notes (H. Holt & Co., N. Y.), but she did little more than copy Prof. KNAPP, his good points as well as his mistakes.

A really good working edition of "Ruy Blas" was consequently yet to be made, and the first impressions gained from looking over Mr. PERRY's performance were sufficient to induce the belief that he had not fallen far short of giving us such an one as every teacher would desire. These impressions have unfortunately not been strengthened by a closer acquaintance; on the contrary, while the editor has added some little aid not given in previous editions (notably in certain heraldic explanations and illustrations), he has frittered away a large part of his space in such insignificant remarks as neither teacher nor pupil needed, and has passed over in silence, or with the merest word, many points which demanded a full explanation. In this connection it may as well be said that Mr. PERRY does not seem to have gone to the best sources for his information, or else has failed to utilize them properly.

In what follows, an attempt will be made to supplement, as well as correct here and there, certain features of Mr. PERRY's notes. And first, we are curious to know the editor's reasons for translating the stage directions throughout the play. It certainly is incongruous, not to say disagreeable, to have the train of French thought continually interrupted by interjected English. These parenthetical remarks contribute largely to the dramatic effect produced upon the reader, and to translate them into a language foreign to the text is simply to mar that effect.

Line 83, *le guet* does not mean the *guard-house* but the *night-watch* or *city patrol*.

LI. 116-117. Was it English prudishness which induced Mr. PERRY to pass over this name *Jeanneton* (=mistress) without a word of explanation? He had a chance here for a neat historical note, tracing the name from its former pastoral and lyric use down to its final and present usage as synonymous with *fille de joie*. As to *Lucinde* and *Isabelle* used in the same sense, HUGO probably employed them because of their frequent occurrence in Spanish drama.

L. 146. *Célimène*. The teacher familiar with his MOLIÈRE will at once recognize here the famous coquette of the "Misanthrope," but what will the poor student do, in whom Mr. PERRY had no right to presuppose any such knowledge?

L. 789. *Astre de la mer*. ST. BERNARD, who lived in the twelfth century (1090-1153), was the first to apply to the Virgin this appellation of *Stella Maris*, Star of the Sea. The passage in which he thus speaks of her is full of beauty, not to say poetry, but is too long to quote *in extenso*. I give just a few sentences:

"Ipsa est igitur nobilis illa stella ex Jacob orta, cujus radius universum orbem illuminat, cujus splendor et prae fulget in supernis, et inferos penetrat: terras etiam perlustrans, et califaciens magis mentes, quam corpora, fovet virtutes, excoquit vitia. Ipsa, inquam, est praeclara et eximia stella, super hoc mare magnum et spatiosum necessario sublevata, micans meritis, illustrans exemplis." (Sancti Bernardi Opera omnia, vol. i, p. 749. Parisiis, apud Claudium Robustel, mdccxix. Can be seen in the Congressional Library, Washington, D. C.).

L. 1041. . . . *L'impôt des huit mille hommes*. Neither Mr. PERRY nor Prof. KNAPP has any definite information on this tax for the "eight thousand men," and I am not sure that I have myself. NUÑEZ DE CASTRO, from whom HUGO may have taken the expression either directly or indirectly, mentions, in enumerating the revenues of Spain, a certain levy for *los ocho mil soldados*. A passage in VOLT-AIRE'S 'Siècle de Louis XIV' (ch. v) may throw some light on the question. He says: "Charles IV, ce duc de Lorraine chassé de ses Etats, et à qui il restait pour tout bien une armée de huit mille hommes qu'il vendait tous les ans au roi d'Espagne, vint auprès de Paris avec cette armée." This was long before the time assigned to the action of the play, but the tax having been once laid, it continued to be collected; and as the duke is no longer receiving it (he died in 1690), CAMPOREAL appropriates it to his own use.

L. 1074. *Les montagnes bleues*. The editor, after mentioning several countries in which mountains of this name occur, makes the flip-pant remark that the reader may take his choice. Not at all. HUGO is sometimes absurd, but not so much so as this. He evident-

ly had in mind Jamaica, which had been a Spanish dependency from the time of its discovery by COLUMBUS up to 1655, when it fell into the hands of the English under Admirals PENN and VENABLES, who had been sent by CROMWELL against Hispaniola.

L. 1685. *Croix-maries*. Mr. PERRY confidently translates this by *cruzados*. That is well enough for all practical purposes, but why not tell us something about this strange word *croix-maries*? This explanation, by the *laquais*, of the money he brings to D. César was suggested to HUGO, as MOREL-FATIO has pointed out, by a passage in the 'Etat présent de l'Espagne' by the Abbé DE VAYRAC. Under the Austrian monarchy there was a silver coin in vogue called a *maria*, from the circumstance of its having on its obverse the name of the Virgin surmounted by a cross. The poet seems to have seized upon this fact and created the word *croix-marie*.

Finally it may be added that the *édition définitive* of Ruy Blas for class purposes has not yet been made. It may not be worth while to undertake to set right the many discrepancies originating in the poet's teeming imagination, in its riotous course through Spanish political and social history; but a great deal more in this line can and should be done. The teacher who wishes to go into this line of investigation will find some valuable aid in A. MORAL-FATIO'S 'Etudes sur l'Espagne,' première série (Paris: F. Vieweg, 1888).

SAMUEL GARNER.

U. S. Naval Academy.

CORRESPONDENCE.

"WH" IN AMERICA.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS: Prof. HEMPL's interesting remarks in the May number of the NOTES on the variation between *w* and *wh* will, it is to be hoped, induce many others to send observations on the point. I can speak only for my own dialect, but it is likely that what is true of that is also true of much though not all New England pronunciation. The rule stated by Prof. HEMPL is not observed by me, and I doubt if *wh* is ever in my dialect pronounced as *w*. The word

warf for *wharf* is very likely not the only case of its kind in New England now, and some time ago it certainly was not—at least for one dialect, that of the ‘Biglow Papers.’ It was this that suggested to me the possibility that *wh* in the present pronunciation might be partly due to the influence of the school-teachers. I do not remember, however, having expressed in print the opinion that that really is the explanation, even for New England only, though I was inclined to think so.

Prof. HEMPL's conclusion that it is most likely that there has been no change in the larger part of our country looks not improbable, though I should hesitate to say “the larger part”; and the connection with last century English which is suggested as explaining the co-existence of *wh* and *w* (stressed and unstressed respectively) is tempting and probable. It may be difficult to establish such a connection, however, beyond possibility of reasonable doubt. The following comments are intended to stimulate further investigation by mentioning some difficulties, not necessarily all very great, and by suggesting other possibilities. 1. Some American peculiarities are quite possibly new developments in this country. A comparison of modern English dialects, which perhaps have not as yet varied very much from their last century forms, except so far as they have suffered influence from the “standard” English, or adjacent dialects, may often give light. 2. SWEET's statement (‘Hist. of Eng. Sounds,’ § 918 end), as Prof. HEMPL says, is expressed only as a probability; it is not a certainty, and opinions may differ as to the strength of the probability. Moreover, not all dialects which have *w* for older *wh* necessarily made the change at the same time or even began it in the same century. 3. Is the pronunciation of *wh* as *h*+*w* (two consonants, one following the other) uncommon in America? The pronunciation as unvoiced *w*, a simple consonant related to *w* as *f* is to *v*, is not accepted by all Americans; see WHITNEY, ‘Oriental and Linguistic Studies,’ 2d series, pp. 268, 269. I think the pronunciation of *wh* varies in America as it very likely also varied in England in the last century and perhaps earlier, so far as it was distinct from *w*. Now unless we take *wh* as an unvoiced *w* the

comparison with *f* (*v*) in *of* (*ov*) and *off* (*of*) is hardly admissible. Indeed in any case the analogy is not quite exact, for in the one case the consonant follows the vowel, and similar cases where the consonant precedes are perhaps less numerous than those where it follows; compare the voiced *th* (*ð*) in certain pronouns and other words (*thou, this, there*, etc.), and on the other hand the *s* (*z*) in noun plurals and the third person singular of verbs. But whichever pronunciation we assume for *wh*, I think the sound which we should naturally compare is *h*, which in unaccented syllables tends to disappear (*tell 'im*, etc.), the living speech showing in the same word a variation between *h* and nothing, and here there seems to be one disagreement. Initial *h*, so far as I am aware, when beginning a sentence or a breath-group is not lost in American speech, even though the following vowel be unaccented; we do not omit the *h* in *he told me so*. Now the examples given for living usage by Prof. HEMPL appear to have *w* for *wh* in such cases, and for this I do not at this moment think of any parallel. To be sure, *wh* and *h* may not have had always a parallel history in English dialects; cf. the Norfolk dialects as treated by ELLIS, ‘Early Eng. Pron.,’ vol. v. (c.g. p. 272), with which may be compared his remarks on *wh* and *h* (p. 833), and the words (p. 236): “Thus in the Eastern United States, New York and Massachusetts, there is a tinge of Norfolk.” What he had in mind when this last was written I do not know. 4. It is conceivable that one or both of the exceptions mentioned by Prof. HEMPL (accented *wy*=*why* as an exclamation, and *warf*=*wharf*) are survivals from an earlier state of things. I suggest, however, that *warf* may have been an importation from some other dialect, perhaps carried into the West by settlers from the New England coast. 5. Is a foreign influence leading to *w* for *wh* entirely out of the question? The *wh* was probably harder than *w* for many of the immigrants from the continent of Europe. 6. The fact that all the examples given (except *warf*) with *w* for written *wh* are interrogative or relative words, may be of consequence. These are the commonest words beginning with *wh* in the language. How about nouns and verbs, such

as *wheel*, *whirl*, when stressed and unstressed? 7. Artificial influence seems rather unlikely as an explanation of the phenomena noted in Michigan, but it is not entirely impossible that it at least assisted the *wh* as distinct from *w*. But it is unnecessary to call in this factor if a satisfactory explanation can be reached without it. 8. Scotch or Irish influence has not been equally strong in all parts of the country, and in the New England of forty or fifty years ago and earlier it was presumably much weaker than in many other regions. How great the influence of New England speech in the Western States has been has yet to be investigated.

At some future time I hope to return to the subject of artificial influence, a careful treatment of which would, in my opinion, be of considerable value for dialect work in this country. The *wh* question would form but a part, and probably a comparatively small part, of such a treatment.

E. S. SHELDON.

Harvard University.

BEDE AND RABBINICAL LITERATURE.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—In two recent papers ("The Name Cædmon" and "Old English Literature and Jewish Learning") I had occasion to collect some of the evidence tending to show an indebtedness of the Old English literature to Rabbinical tradition. A further indication of the same purport is contained in LAUCHERT'S 'Geschichte des Physiologus' (Strassburg, 1889), p. 96:

"... Beda (672-735), der zu Job 29, 18 (in Job 1. II. c. 12) die Geschichte vom Phönix anführt; schon Bochart (II. S. 819) hat bemerkt, dass Beda der einzige christliche Autor sei, der diese Stelle aus Job statt von der Palme (daneben auch) vom Phönix verstehe, während sich sonst diese Auffassung nur in rabbinischer Literatur finde."

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

BRIEF MENTION.

The late U. S. Consul at Prague, CHARLES JONAS, has published a small volume of three

hundred pages entitled: 'Bohemian Made Easy: A Practical Bohemian Course for English-speaking People.' In a brief introduction, the author tells us that he has written this work in answer to frequent demands for a practical guide to Bohemian, and he gives some interesting statistics concerning the half million Bohemians, the Bohemian language, the origin and development of the Bohemian press, in America. He then divides his material into four parts: i, Pronunciation; ii, Grammar forms, with exercises after the Ahn method (150 pp.); iii, Conversation (90 pp.) and iv, Grammar proper (a sketch of 27 pp.). The characteristic features of the treatise are its simplicity and practical arrangement, the appropriateness of the words (with pronunciation indicated) and examples used to illustrate the grammatical rules and the numerous idioms that it contains. The little book might thus form an easy practical introduction to Slavonic, especially where an opportunity is offered to speak Bohemian. The descriptions of the sounds, however, leave much to be desired for the student who has no knowledge of Slavonic phonetics, as when the author speaks of the "mellow sound of *t*," or cites English *lid*, *lead* as having "the same vowel sound," or gives the rule for his language: *A sound for every letter and a letter for every sound and no silent letters*, illustrated by *Česká řeč*=chesská rshěch, *srdce*=sertsě, *tkadlec*=kädlets, *zkažte*=skäshtě, *svrchní*=swekhñee, etc. (The Slavie, Racine, Wis.)

The Open Court Publishing Company of Chicago, has added another interesting number to its rapidly increasing list of important publications on psychology. 'The Diseases of Personality,' by TH. RIBOT, the distinguished professor of comparative psychology at the Collège de France, reads like a novel. The chapter treating of "Disorders of the Intellect," is perhaps the most interesting one of the book for the student of language. It covers a discussion of cerebral dualism, of the coexistence of two states of consciousness, of the rôle of memory, of ideas which, as representing states of consciousness, "are only a secondary factor in the constitution and changes of personality."

Mr. E. W. SCRIPTURE, Fellow of Clark University, has recently sent out an interesting reprint from WUNDT's *Philosophische Studien* (vi, 4) on "Vorstellung und Gefühl, eine Experimentelle Untersuchung." The general conclusion arrived at in the monograph is as follows:

In jedem Zustand des geistigen Lebens finden sich immer Vorstellungsbestandtheile und Gefühlsbestandtheile vereinigt. Beide besitzen verschiedene, immer wechselnde grade der Bewusstheit vom Maximalgrad der höchsten Aufmerksamkeit bis ins Unbewusste . . . sie sind coordinirte Theilerscheinungen des seelischen Verlaufs, und, unabhängig von dem Grad der Bewusstheit, ist bald das Gefühl bald die Vorstellung bald die Verbindung beider auf der Verlauf der Vorstellungen von Einfluss.

DE VIGNY'S 'La Canne de jonc' comes from the press of D. C. Heath & Co., with Notes by V. J. T. SPIERS, of the Penn Charter School. The editor has done his work most conscientiously and has erred rather in the excess of his explanations. For one hundred and twenty-four pages of text, somewhat loosely printed, there are eighty-three pages of notes, averaging one note to nearly every line of text. Consequently, the larger number are translations which are obvious, and definitions which should have been left to a lexicon. There are two appendices, one on *il est-C'est*, the other on *faire*, followed by an infinitive. Pp. v, 220.

In the new official publication of the University of Michigan, *The University Record* (vol. i, No. 1), we note the following papers presented before the Philological Association of the University: "Middle English open *o* in Modern English," by Prof. GEORGE HEMPL; "The Historical Actuality of Dante's Beatrice," by Prof. EDWARD L. WALTER; "Voiced and Voiceless Consonants," by Prof. CALVIN THOMAS.

PERSONAL.

Mr. H. S. WHITE, Professor of the German Language and Literature in Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., has been offered the chair of German in Stanford University, Palo Alto, Cal. Prof. WHITE will not decide definitely to accept, or decline, this brilliant offer till he has inspected in person the California situation

which he purposes to do during the next academic year.

Mr. ADOLPHE COHN, Assistant Professor of French in Harvard University, has been called to Columbia College, N. Y., as Professor of Romance Languages and Literatures.

Dr. ADOLPH GERBER has resigned his position as Professor of Modern Languages in Earlham College, Richmond, Ind. Professor GERBER intends to spend the next academic year in Europe, where he will devote himself to the study especially of the Teutonic languages.

The post vacated by Dr. GERBER has been filled by the appointment of Mr. STARR W. CUTTING, formerly Professor of Modern Languages in the University of South Dakota (Vermillion).

Professor FRED N. SCOTT of the department of English in the University of Michigan, has been invited by Dr. WM. T. HARRIS, United States Commissioner of Education, to prepare a monograph on "Instruction in English in American Universities" for the Educational series published under the direction of Prof. H. B. ADAMS of the Johns Hopkins University.

Mr. E. H. BABBITT, of New York City, has been appointed Instructor of German in Columbia College, N. Y. Mr. BABBITT has gone to Germany for the summer, where he purposes to collect material for future publication on some interesting and important pedagogical topics of the modern languages.

Dr. HUGO K. SCHILLING, Professor of Modern Languages in Wittenberg College, Springfield, O. (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. i, p. 129), has been appointed Assistant Professor of German in Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Rev. J. C. BRACQ has been appointed Associate Professor of Modern Languages in Vassar College, N. Y. Mr. BRACQ is a native Frenchman who received his early education in Cambay and Reims. After coming to America, he studied at McGill University, Montreal, and subsequently at the Newton Theological Institution. In 1883, he returned to Europe where he spent three years, partly in study, then came back to America as Secretary of a religious society of France. He has been a contributor to the religious press of this country, especially to the *Christian Union*.